Quarterly

Vol. XV. Part III.

THE JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

March 1946

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE
1947

Annual Subs., Inland, Rs. 6. Foreign, 10 Shillings.

Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

CONTENTS

VOL. XV] [PART III

Pages.

The Late Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer by K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar, B.A., B.L. ..

The Quest of Sītā by R. Narayana Aiyar, I.C.S. (Retd.) .. 83—109

On a Meaning of the word Kauśika by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., PH.D. .. 110—116

Nandivarman II Pallavamalla: Date of Accession by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, M.A., PH.D. .. 117—126

Some Evidence for the Date of the Aśvacikitsita of Nakula (before A.D. 1000) .. 127—134

The Memorable Message of the Heliodorus Column at Besnagar by K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar, B.A., B.L. .. 135—137

The K. S. R. I—Second Foundation Day
—Address by Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer. .. 139—142

—Address by Dr. Sir Alagappa Chettiar, M.A., D.LITT., LL.D., BAR-AT-LAW .. 142—143

Śilappadikāram by Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai .. 144—149

Dara Shikoh's *Majma-ul-Bahrain* by Dr. V. Raghavan .. 150—157

Book-Review .. 158

Obituary .. 158—161

THE LATE SIR P. S. SIVASWAMI IYER.

In the passing away of Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer at the ripe age of 82, the world of Samskrit scholarship has sustained an irreparable loss. He was the President of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Oriental Research from its starting in 1927 till recently when the Journal was transferred to the management of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras. He was a Samskrit scholar of eminence and took a great interest in research and Indological studies. He was also an eminent Hindu lawyer who, early in his life, began a careful critical study of the original Samskrit texts upon which the Hindu Law was based and argued many Hindu Law cases with erudition and research into the original sources of Hindu Law. When the Madras Law Journal was started in 1891, he translated portions of the Hindu Law Texts hitherto untranslated then, such as the Mitakshara, Achara Adhyaya and the Parasara Madhaviya, and his translations were published in the Journal. He made a very diligent study of the Smritis and his conclusions were always arrived at after a critical, scientific and impartial enquiry, free from any predilections either in favour of India's past or of the changing times. The results of his indefatigable studies are enshrined in the book entitled 'The Evolution of Hindu Moral Ideals' embodying his 'Kamala Lectures' delivered in the Calcutta University and also in another work entitled 'Ahimsa and Asanga' containing the Besant Lectures delivered by him in the Madras University.

He was deeply devoted to the study of Samskrit literature almost till the very last day of his life. Even when his mental powers were very much impaired by age, he still pursued his careful and industrious study of the Ramayana and the Bhagavata and the works of Kalidasa, with the help of a Pandit. His knowledge of the Samskrit language was deep and accurate. He even mastered the intricacies of Samskrit grammar. But we have to mention specially that he was passionately fond of the Bhagavata. Though the cast of his mind was intellectual, yet, his emotions were deeply stirred when he read it. So great was the hold of the Bhagavata and its hero, Lord Sri Krishna, upon his mind that, on the night previous to the day of his death, he was heard to mutter often the beautiful sloka containing the love message of Rukmini to the Lord, श्रुत्वा गुणान् भुवनसुन्दर शृण्वतां ते etc.

He heartily co-operated with his intimate friend and colleague, the late Sri V. Krishnaswami Iyer in the organisation and introduction of the scheme of the Oriental Titles

examinations in the University of Madras. It was during his Advocate-Generalship that the scheme for Samskrit studies in the Trivadi Samskrit College was framed. He was more than thirty years the President of the Committee of Management of the Madras Sanskrit College and his love of the Institution has been expressed in his legacy of Rs. 10,000 to the institution. For the last four years he was the President of the Samskrit Academy. In the work of the college, he took a keen active interest.

He wrote a fine introduction to the Srimad Bhagavata published in condensed form by Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., and in it he has given expression to his intense appreciation of the Bhagavata and to its hold upon his mind. He says as follows: " The lilt of the verse in the Bhagavata has a peculiar charm of its own; it varies with the occasion as it is gay or grave, from the lighter and swift-moving measure of the madrigal and the pastoral song to the slow and solemn measure of the hymn. There is a solemnity and grandeur in the devotional songs which attunes the mind to the high theme." He sums up his impressions of the Bhagavata thus: " No other work in the Hindu religious literature has made a more careful study of the psychology of bhakti. The man who truly loves God cannot possibly go astray."

He was a great and good man. His life of nobility and purity of character and integrity of mind is a model for his countrymen to follow. South India will ever continue to cherish the memory of this Grand Old Man.

K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar.

THE QUEST OF SĪTĀ

A CRITICAL STUDY OF VĀLMĪKI'S TECHNIQUE.

R. NARAYANA AIYAR, I.C.S. (*Retd.*).

In the Saṅkṣepa Rāmāyana we read

ततो गृध्रस्य वचनात्संपातेर्हनुमान्बली ।
शतयोजनविस्तीर्णं पुप्लुवे लवणार्णवम् ॥

I. i. 70

and 'sampātivacana' is frequently referred to[1] as the means by which the vānaras who followed Angada in quest of Sītā learnt that she was immured in Laṅkā. Now Sampāti, that mighty eagle, was known to Rāma as elder brother to Jaṭāyu. He was probably not unknown to Sugrīva who seemed to be aware of everything in the world, barring Rāvaṇa's lurking-place!—cf. कथं भवान्विजानीते सर्वं वै मण्डलं भुवः (IV. xlvi. 1). And yet, neither in his instructions to Aṅgada nor in those to the commanders despatched to the other three quarters, did Sugrīva mention Sampāti as one whom they might perhaps come across. Nor in their search of the 'Vindhya' and 'Malaya' ranges did Aṅgada and his host discover him, thorough though their search of the region was, and stationary though the great bird was in that region. Sampāti in the epic is a *deus ex machina* whom the Poet hoists on to the stage when the vānaras were in a desperate plight, and their great leaders, Jāmbavān, Hanumān and the rest were at the end of their resources and altogether bankrupt of counsel. As his name imports, Sampāti just *happened* (from Sam+Pat to happen); his appearance in the nick of time to solve their difficulties was a pure accident. Chance had played a part in Rāma's history before; but the Poet had displayed the train of events in its wake as controlled by the hero's strong character and purposive conduct, for instance when

1. I. iii. 26; V, xiii. 5, 53; xxxi-14; xxxv. 62-63, 67; VI. cxxix. 43.

ज्ञातिदासी यतोजाता कैकेय्यास्तु सहोषिता ।
प्रासादं चन्द्रसंकाशमारुरोह यदृच्छया ॥

II. vii. 1

and when

तथाऽऽसीनस्य रामस्य कथासंसक्तचेतसः ।
तं देशं राक्षसी काचिदाजगाम यदृच्छया ॥

III. xvii. 7

with momentous consequences, in the former case his exile from the kingdom स्त्रीतृतीयं च्युतं राज्याद्धर्मकामं च केवलम् VI. cxxvii. 5, as Bharadvājā put it; in the latter case the mortal enmity of Rāvaṇa leading to Rāma's separation from his beloved. In the vital matter of the tracing of the abducted heroine to Laṅkā, however, instead of exhibiting it as due to the hero's superior virtues or valour or to the skill and resource of his divinely-appointed monkey ally and his agents, the Poet has attributed it to sheer chance and made the story of her recovery hang and turn on this hinge. Not only does this strike one as incongruous, but there is also a certain air of unreality in the circumstances under which Sampāti 'happened' in the history. When Rāma retired to Prasravaṇagiri after the vānaras had been despatched on their quest, he had a right to expect that Aṅgada's party would rapidly complete the search of the mountain ranges and caves and river valleys in the south and get to the Southern Ocean where

सिद्धचारणसङ्घैश्च प्रकीर्णं सुमनोहरम् ।
तमुपैति सहस्राक्षः सदा पर्वसु पर्वसु ॥

IV. xli. 23

a spot renowned in our Tamil literature as 'குரங்கு செய்கடற் குமரியம் பெருந்துறை'[1], and that Hanuman would lose no time in crossing to Laṅkā. Their actual proceedings were very different. They lost themselves in the mazes of the Vindhya and the Malaya, विचेतव्यप्रदेशेषु बहुषु विद्यमानेषु, as the learned commentator points out (IV. l. 4). The leaders including Hanumān displayed no consciousness of the supreme and solemn charge that had been laid on them to search Rāvaṇa's abode,

1. Maṇimekhalai, ch. 5-'the lovely holy bathing ghat of Kanyākumari where lies the sea on which the monkeys did work'. *see* M. Raghava Aiyangar, ஆராய்ச்சித் தொகுதி, p. 30.

Laṅkā, above all other places. I suggest that it did not suit the Poet's purpose as a literary artist that Hanumān should find Sītā before the month was out, *i.e.*, by the end of Pouṣa or indeed till towards the end of the period of exile, *i.e.* Phālguna. Hence the double search of the same region

अद्यापि तद्वनं दुर्गं विचिन्वन्तु वनौकसः ।
खेदं त्यक्त्वा पुनः सर्वैर्वनमेतद्विचीयताम् ॥

IV. xlix. 7

Hence that ṛkṣabila episode, which reads too much like a tale out of the Arabian Nights or out of those fabulous and incredible ramblings of Ulysses into which the genius of Homer ebbed and eddied in the decline of its vigour, and which has no organic connection with the main action and was obviously interposed to fill up time. Hence the amusing but rather unconvincing prāyopaveśana scene. Hence finally the Sampāti episode.

That episode one is inclined at first to dismiss as beset with manifest improbability and not altogether indispensable for the framework of the Poem considered as a work of art. But it is with the Rāmāyaṇa as with Mathematics. "*Allez en avant,*" said a great French mathematician, "*et la foi vous viendra*"—'Get along and the faith will come to you!' 'Every mathematical book that is worth anything must be read backwards and forwards,' was his advice. By constant musing I struck a line of thought which I proceed to develop.

To deal first with the *time factor* referred to above, the scheme of Vālmīki's story required that Sītā should remain Rāvaṇa's captive for a twelvemonth, and that her restoration to Rāma after a comparatively short campaign—really a punitive expedition, daṇḍayātrā—should be followed at its heels by the restoration of the kingdom to him. The Poet, having made his hero and heroine traverse the length of the forest on foot, मां चाप्यरण्यं नयतः पदातिम्, V, xxxvi. 29, designed for his climax a splendid and spectacular aerial voyage for them in a celestial car. He had to time their return to the capital to occur in the same glorious and auspicious month of Chaitra which Daśaratha had chosen for the coronation fourteen years before.

चैत्रः श्रीमानयं मासः पुण्यः पुष्पितकाननः ।
यौवराज्याय रामस्य सर्वमेवोपकल्प्यताम् ॥

II. iii. 4

and not a day sooner or later than Rāma had promised to Bharata.

चतुर्दशे हि संपूर्णे वर्षेऽहनि रघूत्तम ।
न द्रक्ष्यामि यदि त्वां तु प्रवेक्ष्यामि हुताशनम् ॥
तथेति च प्रतिज्ञाय....
अनेन धर्मशीलेन वनात्प्रत्यागतः पुनः ।
भ्रात्रा सह भविष्यामि पृथिव्याः पतिरुत्तमः ॥

II. cxii. 25, 26; cxi. 31

Between the hero's re-union with the lost heroine and his reinstatement in the lost kingdom no event of secondary importance must be interposed, such, for instance, as the installation of[1] Vibhīṣaṇa; nor must any stretch of time intervene which Rāma, who was under a vow (IV. xxvi. 9) not to enter villages or townships during the exile, would perforce have to pass in the forest. For the Poet to remit him after his stupendous achievements to 'tarumūlas' (foot of trees) in Daṇḍaka, there to resume his penitential exercises and await the expiration of the time fixed by Kaikeyī, were it acceptable even to her, would be sheer bathos. As we should expect in a great epic, Vālmīki attains to the sublime at the 'exitus' (end), and by what Greek rhetoricians called 'auxesis' [2], a series of magnificent incidents, heaped one upon another, ascending by a continued gradation to a summit of grandeur[3], or, as Sanskrit rhetoricians say, of the 'adbhuta rasa' or marvellous sentiment, which should characterize the close of a mahākāvya, गोपुच्छाग्ररीत्या, [4] crowding surprises in the manner of the bush at the end of a cow's tail.

---

1. The Poet who compares the coronation of Rāma, VI. cxxxi 62, and of Sugrīva, IV. xxvi. 35, to that of Indra by the eight Vasus, omits, not without significance, the phrase 'वसवो वासवं यथा' in his description of Vibhīṣaṇa's coronation, VI. cxv. 14, 15.

2. 'Auxesis'—Lat. incrementum, an ascending towards a climax; 'Amplification'.

3. Longinus on the Sublime, Pt. I, sect. xi.

4. ' कार्यं गोपुच्छाग्रं कर्तव्यं काव्यबन्धमासाद्य ।
ये चोदात्ता भावाः ते सर्वे पृष्ठतः कार्याः ॥
सर्वेषां काव्यानां नानारसभावयुक्तियुक्तानाम् ।
निर्वहणे कर्तव्यो नित्यं हि रसोऽद्भुतस्तज्ज्ञैः ॥

Bharata's Nāṭya Śāstra, xx. 46, 47.

I am indebted to Dr. Raghavan for this reference.

So we have, in final solution of all problems and complications in the Plot, a quick succession of marvels and thrills—the vanquishing of Rāvaṇa, the crowning of Vibhīṣaṇa, Sītā's ordeal by fire, the descent of the gods and their intercession, the re-union of the hero and the heroine, the advent of Daśaratha and the revocation of his dread curse on Kaikeyī and Bharata, the return to Ayodhyā by the Puṣpaka, and the re-union with Bharata, all culminating in the resplendent coronation of the hero and the heroine[1]. From the artistic standpoint, therefore, it was essential that these mighty events should occur towards the close of the period of exile.

At the same time, the exigencies of the seasons, and the customs by which princes regulated the conduct of their military expeditions demanded that the search for Sītā should be organized in the autumn as soon as the rains had ceased, that is to say, some five months before the exile was due to end:

विजिगीषूणां कण्टकान् समुद्धर्तुं शरत्काले समुद्योगः ।[2]

Cf. यात्रायै चोदयामास तं शक्तेः प्रथमं शरत् ॥

Raghuvamśa, iv. 24.

Accordingly we find Rāma telling Sugrīva to bestir himself for the punitive expedition against Rāvaṇa towards the end of Āśvayuja—

कार्तिके समनुप्राप्ते त्वं रावणवधे यत ।

IV. xxvi. 16.

The vast numbers required for the search were got together towards the end of the autumnal season, *i.e.*, in Mārgaśīrṣa; and though there were still some four months of exile, we find that Sugrīva restricted the operations of the search gangs to one month. For this limiting of time there

---

1. I. iii. 37, 38.
2. *Cf.* वनस्पतीनां सरसां नदीनां तेजस्विनां कान्तिभृतां दिशां च ।
   निर्याय तस्याः स पुरः समन्ताच्छ्रियं दधानां शरदं ददर्श ॥
   Bhaṭṭikāvya, 28. (II. 1)

‘ शरदुपगमकाले संत्यजन्योगनिद्रां शरणमुपगतानां त्राणहेतोः प्रयास्यन् ।’

Deśika: Pādukāsahasram, xi, 41 (301).

‘ रक्षार्थमाश्रितजनस्य समुज्जिहाने रङ्गेश्वरे शरदि शेषभुजङ्गतल्पात् ।’

ib. xiv. 39 (419).

was a compelling reason. An army marches on its belly. Supplies of food in the regions to be traversed might be precarious and in any case were not to be depended upon. The only land flowing with milk and honey mentioned by Sugrīva was Vaidyuta in the farthest south (IV. xli. 33-4), and that region the vānaras never had to go to. It was out of the question to attach a commissariat to search parties which had to cover incredible distances and move rapidly; the raids which the monkeys made on the stores would for one thing have depleted them in no time. The Poet gives us an indication how Sugrīva and his commander-in-chief, Nīla, solved the problem. We are told (IV. xxix. 30) that at Sugrīva's command Nīla had despatched his generals to different quarters to assemble the vānara forces, that those who went to the north came upon edible roots and fruits in an ancient sacrificial ground in the Himālayas which had the rare and inestimable property of appeasing hunger for a whole month, and that they garnered them and brought them to Sugrīva (IV. xxxvii. 27-37).

तदन्नसंभवं दिव्यं फलं मूलं मनोहरम् ।
यः कश्चित्सकृदश्नाति मासं भवति तर्पितः ॥ ३० ॥

To Nīla who had to feed crores and crores of monkeys this was manna, and we may be sure that it was an immense store that the commanders brought of the precious food. Nīla and Aṅgada would distribute the rations to the four great armies before they set out on their quest, and, as they were warranted to render the monkeys immune from hunger for a month, Sugrīva wisely planned that they must return before they should feel its pangs. There was a notable difference, however, in the orders he issued to the commanders on this point. To Vinata who was despatched to the east the order ran:

मासे पूर्णे निवर्तध्वमुदयं प्राप्य पर्वतम् ॥
ऊर्ध्वं मासान्न वस्तव्यं वसन्वध्यो भवेन्मम ।
सिद्धार्थाः सन्निवर्तध्वमधिगम्य च मैथिलीम् ॥

IV. xl. 67-8.

Similarly to Suṣeṇa who was sent to the west:

अस्तपर्वतमासाद्य पूर्णे मासे निवर्तत ।
ऊर्ध्वं मासान्न वस्तव्यं वसन्वध्यो भवेन्मम ॥

IV. xlii. 50.

These chiefs could reckon the days by the sun and would have little difficulty in obeying the stern order—sugrīvājña, being synonymous with sternness—that they should on pain of death return at the end of a month. Śatabali who was deputed to the north would not see the sun in the extreme north, it being the winter solstice; nevertheless the region will be bright with the light of the golden Soma mountain situate in the middle of Lavaṇasamudra, and as it would be impossible to tell night from day, the monkeys would lose count of time. Sugrīva therefore directed that Śatabali should retrace his steps as soon as he sighted Somagiri. Virtually this order was the same as that given to Vinata and Suṣeṇa, with this difference that he stood to incur no penalty if he happened to be late by a few days. The order to the southern command however was very different. Aṅgada, unless he had to visit the farthest south, was in no danger of losing count of days like Śatabali (though he grew oblivious of the passage of time in the magic cave), and yet he was not peremptorily required to return from his search at the end of the month. In place of the order that whoever tarried beyond the month should be summarily executed, Sugrīva announced that whoever returned from the south within the month and reported that Sītā had been seen would deserve well of him and should receive gifts, and rewards and great honour from him.

[1] यस्तु मासान्निवृत्तोऽग्रे दृष्टा सीतेति वक्ष्यति ।
मत्तुल्यविभवो भोगैः सुखं स विहरिष्यति ॥

IV. xli. 48.

The party that proceeded to the south was not expected to accomplish its purpose within the time limit; there were therefore to be no pains and penalties. The difference in the terms of Sugrīva's command is significant because it reveals the Poet's design that the return of Aṅgada and Hanumān should be put off to the approach of spring. This involved two difficulties. One was that Rāma whose grief waxed with every day of separation from Sītā—

---

1. It was Sugrīva that coined the famous auspicious phrase दृष्टा सीता with its inverted order of words which Hanumān greeted Rāma with:

न्यवेदयदमेयात्मा दृष्टा सीतेति तत्त्वतः I. i. 76.

[1] शोकश्च किल कालेन गच्छता ह्यपगच्छति ।
मम चापश्यतः कान्तामहन्यहनि वर्धते ॥

VI. v. 4,

would grow impatient of the delay and might come to doubt the success of Sugrīva's plans. By way of meeting this the Poet represents the commanders who punctually returned at the end of the month from the east, west and north as assuring Sugrīva and Rāma not only that Sītā was not in any of those quarters but that Hanumān who had gone to the south would see her.

उदारसत्त्वाभिजनो महात्मा स मैथिलीं द्रक्ष्यति वानरेन्द्रः ।
दिशं तु यामेव गता तु सीता तामास्थितो वायुसुतो हनूमान् ॥

IV. xlvii. 14.

Now their word by itself would carry little conviction. Rāvaṇa was capable of hiding himself and Sītā where no one could get at them, as Sītā herself warned Hanumān

अथवाऽऽदाय रक्षांसि न्यसेयुः संवृते हि माम् ।
यत्र ते नाभिजानीयुर्हरयो नापि राघवौ ॥

V. xxxvii. 58.

He might carry Sītā with him for instance and lurk in the ocean-depths or in the nether regions as Valin said—

न्यस्तां सागरतोये वा पाताले वाऽपि मैथिलीम्

IV. xvii. 51,

or, as Lakṣmaṇa picturesquely put it, in Aditi's womb—

यदि यात्यदितेर्गर्भं रावणः सह सीतया ।
तत्राप्येनं हनिष्यामि न चेद्दास्यति मैथिलीम् ॥

IV. i. 121.

How could the Vānara chiefs be so cock-sure then that Sītā would be found in the southern quarter? That they were not giving utterance to a pious hope or an idle prophecy is evident from the fact that Rāma suffered the further delay of two months, Pouṣa and Māgha, *see* Gov. on IV. liii. 21-5, without repining, and was content to abide the return of Hanumān with equanimity. We hear no more vilāpa from him till after

---

1. *Cf.* 'கழியமிக்கதோர் காதல்' Tiruvaimozhi, 5-5-10.

Hanumān brought news of Sītā, when the pangs seized him once more and he burst out in lamentation to Lakṣmaṇa—

न मे दुःखं प्रिया दूरे ; वाहि वात यत कान्ता ; कदा नु चारुबिंबोष्ठं
and so forth.

VI. v. 5 ff.

Its eems very probable that the assurance given by Vinata, Suṣeṇa and Śatabali was inspired. For, Sugrīva had specially commissioned his father-in-law, Suṣeṇa, that when he reached the remote west he should wait upon the holy ṛṣi, Merusāvarṇi, and *ask* him for news of Sītā—

[1] प्रष्टव्यो मेरुसावर्णिर्महर्षिः सूर्यसन्निभः ।
प्रणम्य शिरसा भूमौ प्रवृत्तिं मैथिलीं प्रति ॥

IV. xlii. 47

and we may well suppose that while the great sage would hardly impart details known to him through yoga, he told Suṣeṇa in general terms that all was well with Sītā and that the search in the south whither Hanumān had gone with credentials would be blessed with success. The second difficulty was that by tarrying beyond the month Aṅgada's party would outstep the divine sustenance they had partaken of, and would find themselves in grave peril of starvation. This however suited the Poet's purpose very well as he could introduce Sampāti. It would not indeed sort with his design if the hunger-stricken monkeys made prāyopaveśana soon after the expiry of Pauṣa; so he contrived that they should sojourn for several weeks in the ṛkṣabila enjoying the sumptuous hospitality of Svayamprabhā, and emerge from the cave only at the approach of spring.

1. Quaere: Is this the Merusāvarni whom Svayamprabhā mentions as her father in IV. li. 16? Some think that Svayamprabhā who was hostess to the monkeys was no other than Śāndilī mentioned in the Mahābhārata verse—

शृङ्गाणि वै शृङ्गवतस्त्रीण्येव मनुजाधिप ॥....
सर्वरत्नमयं चैकं भवनैरुपशोभितम् ।
तत्र स्वयंप्रभा देवी नित्यं वसति शाण्डिली ॥

Bhīṣma, viii. 9

ततः पुष्पातिभाराग्राँल्लताशतसमावृतान् ।
द्रुमान्वासान्तिकान्दृष्ट्वा बभूवुर्भयशङ्किताः ॥
ते वसन्तमनुप्राप्तं प्रतिबुद्ध्वा परस्परम् ।
नष्टसन्देशकालार्था निपेतुर्धरणीतले ॥
मासः पूर्णो बिलस्थानां हरयः किं न बुध्यते ॥

IV. liii. 20, 21, 24

By means, then, of the discovery of precious foods in the foot-hills of the Himālayas, and by means of enduing them with the virtue of giving sustenance for a month, the Poet has contrived skilfully to dovetail the parts of his story into one another. He devised that the members of the most important of the search parties should outstrip that sustenance, and famishing seek food and water in a dark cave where they should tarry unmindful of time, and that their situation when they came out of it should be so desperate that he could bring in Sampāti to revive their drooping spirits with news of Sītā. The three other parties should meanwhile have returned to Kiṣkindhā to cheer Rāma up with the firm hope of Hanumān's successful accomplishment of his mission. As Hanuman said—

मय्यगच्छति चेहस्थे धर्मात्मानौ महारथौ ।
आशया तौ धरिष्येते वानराश्च मनस्विनः ।

V. xiii. 39

but their message helped Rama await his return with composure.

But why Sampāti at all? This question leads us to a consideration of the other factors that determined the course of the search for Sītā, and we shall proceed to analyse them. Sītāparimārgaṇa was incomparably the most stupendous task set to man or monkey. Jaṭāyu likened it to a search for a potent herb in the forest.

यामोषधिमिवायुष्मन्नन्वेषसि महावने ।

III. lxvii. 15

He was referring only to the search in Daṇḍaka, but it very soon became apparent to Rāma that the area to be combed was much wider, indeed conterminous with the earth as known to the most eminent geographer that flourished in that age, Sugrīva. (It falls here to be noted that if we are to appreciate Vālmīki's poem we must not quarrel with Sugrīva's geography;

we do not let Milton's cosmogony interfere with our enjoyment of *Paradise Lost.*) 'Rāvaṇālaya' to which Danu had said Sugrīva would go in quest of Sīta—

स यास्यति वरारोहां निर्मलां रावणालये ।

III. lxxii. 25

was known to Sugrīva (IV. xli. 24-5). Rāvaṇa's 'nilaya' in the sense of 'lurking-place' was not known. As Tilaka explaining the word in

तत्र सीतां च वैदेहीं निलयं रावणस्य च ।

IV. xl. 18.

points out,

निलयं रावणस्य निलयं स्थानम् । यद्वा चतुर्दिक्षु रावणवासस्थानमनेन सूचितम् ।

This was *Factor Number One* in the problem, and as we shall see the least troublesome factor.

Lakṣmaṇa had suggested that Rāma could secure the help of the Maharṣis to find out where Śītā had been hidden by her captor—

येन राजन्हृता सीता तमन्वेषितुमर्हसि ।
मद्द्वितीयो धनुष्पाणिः सहायैः परमर्षिभिः ॥

III. lxv. 12

and this seemed very feasible as the holy ascetics by the exercise of their yogic powers would have been able to tell Rāma where Sītā was (*e.g.*, Bharadvāja who told Rāma

सर्वं च सुखदुःखं ते विदितं मम राघव ।
सर्वं ममैतद्विदितं तपसा धर्मवत्सल ॥

VI. cxxvii. 9, 16,)

Rāma however never looked to these great men to extricate him from his difficulties or to do for him what he felt his own tapas and his own strong right arm ought to achieve. Did he not tell Śarabhaṅga and Sutīkṣṇa for instance

अहमेवाहरिष्यामि स्वयं लोकान्महामुने ।

III, v, 33; vii. 14

In the words of Bhāravi,

लघयन्खलु तेजसा जगन्न महानिच्छति भूतिमन्यतः ।

Kirātārjunīya, ii. 18.

Take this very matter of Rāvaṇa's permanent address. Rāma was ignorant of it, and till Rāvaṇa carried Sītā off did not seem curious about it, notwithstanding that Viśvāmitra had mentioned him to Daśaratha at the very beginning of the history

श्रूयते हि महावीर्यो रावणो राक्षसाधिपः ।

I. xx. 19;

notwithstanding again that Sūrpaṇakhā had pointedly told Rāma

रावणो नाम मे भ्राता बलीयान् राक्षसेश्वरः ।
वीरो विश्रवसः पुत्रो यदि ते श्रोत्रमागतः ॥
प्रख्यातवीर्यौ च रणे भ्रातरौ खरदूषणौ ।

III. xvii. 23, 25.

He implored Jaṭāyu when he had breathed his last, ब्रूहि ब्रूहि (III. lxviii. 17) as the dying man's kinsmen in the Āzhvār's stanza importune him for the whereabouts of the hidden hoard and of unknown debtors

'சோர்விறைற்பொருள் வைத்ததுண்டாகிற் சொல்லு
சொல்லென்று சுற்றுமிருந்து
ஆர்வினவிலும் வாய்திறவாதே யந்தகால
மடைவதன் முன்னம்'

Periāzhvār-tirumozhi, 4. 5. 3.

Foiled in his attempt to get Jaṭāyu to finish his sentence about Rāvaṇa's abode, Rāma told Danu

नाममात्रं तु जानामि न रूपं तस्य रक्षसः ।
निवासं वा प्रभावं वा वयं तस्य न विद्महे ॥

III. lxxi. 22

and later asked Sugrīva

क्व वा वसति तद्रक्षो महद्व्यसनदं मम ।

IV. vi. 25

If Rāvaṇa heard that, he might well exclaim with Satan, 'Not to know me argues yourselves unknown'; on a like occasion he laughed in the face of Marutta and said—

अकुतूहलभावेन प्रीतोऽस्मि तव पार्थिव ।
धनदस्यानुजं यो मां नावगच्छसि रावणम् ॥
त्रिषु लोकेषु कोऽन्योऽस्ति यो न जानाति मे बलम् ।
भ्रातरं येन निर्जित्य विमानमिदमाहृतम् ॥

VII. xviii. 9-10.

Indeed it is one of the puzzles in the poem that Rāma who could not have been ignorant of Kubera as the regent of the northern quarter had not heard of Rāvaṇa as ruling in Laṅkā. Might it be that as his hero could destroy the three worlds by his own might

त्रैलोक्यं तु करिष्यामि संयुक्तं कालधर्मणा ।
नाशयामि जगत्सर्वं त्रैलोक्यं सचराचरम् ॥

III. lxiv. 63, 72

the Poet thought that he must keep him ignorant of Rāvaṇa's abode as he would otherwise burn Laṅkā up with his arrows even from where he was, and force Rāvaṇa to come to him, which would hardly suit his poem? The learned commentator advances this view which we must take for what it is worth—

तद्वासमात्रज्ञाने तद्भञ्जने स स्वयमेव इह आगमिष्यति इति हि रामाभिप्रायः ।

Govindarāja on IV. vii. 2-3

Need Rāma have remained ignorant of the simple fact of Rāvaṇa's residence of which he had ample opportunities of informing himself? He could have known it from Kulapati who first told him of the misdeeds of 'a certain Khara, younger brother of Rāvaṇa' (II. cxvi. 11), from the ascetics who welcomed him into Daṇḍaka and sought his protection (III. i. 16-20); from the ṛṣis of the āśramamaṇḍala among whom he lived for ten years (III. xi. 24-28); or from the maharṣis who came to congratulate him on his victory over Khara, Dūṣaṇa and their four and ten thousand followers (III. xxx. 38). None of these seem to have mentioned to Rāma that Rāvaṇa the arch-enemy held sway in Laṅkā; and Rāma, we have to suppose, was incurious or was reluctant to ask the great men anything that they did not choose to tell him themselves. He *asked* Viśvāmitra where Mārīca and Subāhu perpetrated their atrocities, because he had been engaged to put an end to them. It would be time enough to ask where Rāvaṇa was when Rāma had any quarrel to settle with him. Whether after Sītā was carried off, the paramarṣis if applied to as suggested by Lakṣmaṇa for information about Rāvaṇa would have been particularly communicative may admit of some doubt. If Damayantī's experience on a similar occasion can be taken as a guide, Rāma would have had little enlightenment from them as to *where* Sītā was held a prisoner. Damayantī asked ṛṣis in the āśramamaṇḍala about the puṇyaśloka—

कश्चिद्भगवतां रम्यं तपोवनमिदं नृपः ।
भवेत्प्राप्तो नलो नाम निषधानां जनाधिपः ॥

Thc answer she got was simply—

पतिमेष्यसि कल्याणि कल्याणाभिजनं नृपम् ॥

And then the holy men vanished with their sacrificial fires and their dwelling huts.

एवमुक्त्वा नलस्येष्टां महिषीं पार्थिवात्मजाम् ।
अन्तर्हितास्तापसास्ते साग्निहोत्राश्रमास्तथा ॥

Mahābhārata, Vana, lxi. 86, 94-5

Even if Rāma was disposed to solicit the help of the sages for ascertaining Sītā's whereabouts, the Poet obviated all necessity for Rāma to go out of his way to seek them by planting Danu Kabandha right athwart his path. Danu imparted to Rāma his divine knowledge of the means, and the only means, by which he could find out and recover Sītā, *viz*, friendship with Sugrīva, with the sacred fire to witness the compact.

अद्रोहाय समागम्य दीप्यमाने विभावसौ ।

III. lxxii. 17

What Danu said was convincing in details and definitive in import, and if Rāma entertained any doubt as to the divine nature of the guidance he received, it was set at rest not only by Danu's rise to the skies in his sight, but particularly by Śabarī's ascent to the abodes of the blest after she had seen Rāma, as had been foretold by Danu. We can best understand the role for which the Poet meant to cast Danu by considering it in relation to Lakṣmaṇa's advice about seeking the help of paramarṣis. Any help which the latter gave would of its very nature be gratuitous; the help that Danu proffered was in return for the supreme service rendered by Rama in faithfully incinerating Danu's huge body which was possible to no other mortal—

तच्छरीरं कबन्धस्य घृतपिण्डोपमं महत् ।
मेदसा पच्यमानस्य मन्दं दहति पावकः ॥

III. lxxii. 3

and delivering him from his age-long curse. This was more in accord with the character of the hero who had declared न हि वर्ते प्रतिग्रहे (II. 1. 43). The ṛṣis again would have give

Rāma their blessing and assured him of eventual success; Danu gave him practical guidance and present help. The Poet describes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa as सुप्रीतौ (III. lxxiii. 44); and Rāma, if he ever entertained the idea of tracing Rāvaṇa's abode by himself and of destroying it in order to compel Rāvaṇa to appear before him, gave it up and decided implicitly to follow the guidance that the gods by means of Danu had vouchsafed him.

अभित्वरे च तं द्रष्टुं सुग्रीवं वानरर्षभम् ।
तदधीनं हि मे सौम्य सीतायाः परिमार्गणम् ॥

III. lxxv. 9

The search for Sītā, then, was not only to be world-wide as we saw, but was to be carried out solely by monkeys under the orders of Sugrīva. This was *Factor Number Two.*

Sugrīva literally had crores of monkeys at his disposal for this business.

शलभा इव संछाद्य मेदिनीं संप्रतस्थिरे ।

IV. xlv. 2

is how the Poet describes them. When Sugrīva had had them mustered (IV. xxxix. 45), he organised the search in four divisions which he assigned to the four quarters. To the divisional commanders he gave minute instructions, but gave also ample liberty to exercise their own discretion as circumstances might dictate

अतोऽन्यदपि यत्कार्यं कार्यस्यास्य हितं भवेत् ।
संप्रधार्य भवद्भिश्च देशकालार्थसंहितम् ॥

IV. xlii. 55

The general orders, besides the time limit already mentioned' were—

सर्वमाशु विचेतव्यं कपिभिः कामरूपिभिः ।

IV. xlii. 17

रावणः सह वैदेह्या मार्गितव्यस्ततस्ततः ॥

IV. xl. 31, 60, 63; xlii. 45

अधिगम्य तु वैदेहीं निलयं रावणस्य च ।

IV. xl. 67; xlii. 50

One injunction was particularly important. Each division was to be an indivisible unit. This is remarkable. Aṅgada, as we know from Hanumān's report to Sītā, had set out with no less than a third of the entire vānara forces, त्रिभागबलसंवृतः V. xxxv. 56. It was not open to him to break his huge army corps up into separate brigades and to assign different tracts to them with a common rendezvous, or to depute, say, Hanumān with a powerful contingent to search Laṅkā and the other islands. The search in every region was to be conducted by all the vānaras of the division *together*. This indeed sorted very well with the habits of monkeys who were accustomed to move about in troops. Accordingly we find—

विचित्य दिवसं सर्वे सीताधिगमने धृताः ।
समायान्ति स्म मेदिन्यां निशाकालेषु वानराः ॥

IV. xlvii. 4

again,

मार्गध्वं सहिताः सर्वे रामपत्नीं यशस्विनीम् ॥

IV. xl. 29

ते विचित्य पुनः खिन्ना विनिष्पत्य समागताः ।
एकान्ते वृक्षमूले तु निषेदुर्दीनमानसाः ॥

IV. xlviii. 23

also,

तत्र वायुसुतः सर्वं विचिनोति स्म पर्वतम् ।
परस्परेण हनुमानन्योन्यस्याविदूरतः ॥

IV. l. 5

Monkeys being gregarious by nature, why, it may be asked, did Sugrīva insist that they should conduct their search सहिताः and समागताः: , i.e. संघीभूताः ? Two reasons may be suggested. Once the monkey gangs got separated, they would wander about aimlessly in search not of Sītā but of one another !

नित्यमस्थिराचित्ता हि कपयो हरिपुङ्गव ।

IV. liv. 9

अनेकचित्ताः was how Rāvaṇa characterised them (VI. xxiv. 27) They were quite capable of forgetting their quest! Did not even their great leaders lose sight of it in Svayamprabhā's cave? Another reason perhaps is this. What Sugrīva had ordered for this business of search was a *levée en masse*, of able-bodied monkeys indeed, but of varying quality. There

were no cowards among them; Rāma, like the great commander he was, magnanimously offered on the eve of the war to excuse those from service who did not feel equal to it.

> यच्च फल्गु बलं किंचित्तदत्रैवोपयुज्यताम् ।
> एतद्धि कृत्यं घोरं नो विक्रमेण प्रयुध्यताम् ॥

VI. iv. 14

which reminds us of King Henry's speech on the eve of Agincourt—

> "He which hath no stomach to this fight,
> Let him depart; his passport shall be made
> And crowns for convoy put into his purse."

Henry V, IV. iii. 35

But among the rank and file were these—

> ये प्रसक्ताश्च कामेषु दीर्घसूत्राश्च वानराः ।
> इहानयस्व तान्सर्वाञ्शीघ्रं तु मम शासनात् ॥

IV. xxxvii. 11

We have all met with these dilatory individuals and know them well; they are चिरक्रियाः, procrastinators, उद्योगं कुर्वाणा इव कालयापकाः We have all a sneaking fondness for them; they are the men in our public offices to whom we used to give an extension year after year after they had attained their fifty-fifth year, and whom nowadays we 're-employ' after retirement! It was incumbent upon the divisional commanders that these dīrgha-sūtras were not left behind on any account. 'நொண்டி ஆடு வந்துதான் படல் சாத்த வேணும்', as we say in Tamil. One wonders why they were allowed to hamper the search at all, for it is they that must have set the pace in a service in which everything while it had to be done thoroughly had to be done rapidly as well, आशु आशु. Perhaps there was some solid merit in them. Perhaps they were more thorough and reliable than the common run of monkeys who must have been flighty. Perhaps also the Poet meant us to understand that Rāmakain-karya embraced all and that there was no question of excluding anybody as belonging to the category of tāmasakartā. "They also serve who stand and wait." This, then, was *Factor Number Three*, viz. that the search for Sītā, conditioned as it was by Factors one and Two, was *mass work* in the first instance.

"In the first instance," because, in the first stage of the search the monkeys could only be expected to find a *likely* person, a beautiful woman well guarded in her captivity who was *most probably Sītā.* Sītā's identity was not known to the vānaras. Beautiful women were to be found in all parts of the world, and the vānaras might easily mistake one of them for Sītā. Was it not perhaps strikingly and comically to illustrate this difficulty that the Poet makes the intelligent Hanumān himself dance in an ecstasy of joy when he took Maṇḍodarī to be Sītā ?

आस्फोटयामास चुचुम्ब पुच्छं ननन्द चिक्रीड जगौ जगाम ।
स्तम्भानरोहन्निपपात भूमौ निदर्शयन्स्वां प्रकृतिं कपीनाम् ॥

V. x. 55

Or, Rāvaṇa who knew a hundred magical arts

ततोऽपधार्य मायानां शतमेकं समाप्तवान् ।

VII. xxiii. 16

might create a māyāsītā for the benefit of inquisitive monkeys; was not Hanumān, again,—even he who had seen and spoken with Sītā—deceived by one such on the battle-field?

त्यक्त्वा प्राणान्विवेष्टन्तो रामप्रियचिकीर्षव: ।
यन्निमित्तं हि युध्यामो हता सा जनकात्मजा ॥

IV. lxxxii. 22

cf.

यत्कृतेऽरीन्व्यगृह्णीम समुद्रमतराम च ।
सा हतेति वदन्नाममुपातिष्ठन्मरुत्सुत: ॥

Bhaṭṭikāvya, xvii. 23

The supreme and almost insuperable difficulty for the vānara leaders was, how to establish the identity of Sītā when they imagined they had found her. Suppose for instance that the eastern division came upon a fair captive in a cave in Udayagiri, Vinata could hardly present himself before her at the head of his troop of monkeys and address her, like H.M. Stanley, "Sītā Devī I presume?" It was his own identity he would have to establish in the first instance, and for this purpose he would have to go back to Kiṣkindhā to fetch his credentials! From the wonderful technique which Hanumān invented for himself we know that the search in its second stage, that is, the establishment of Sītā's identity, the

inducing of confidence in her, the holding of converse with her, the administering of solace to her, aud the exchange of tokens, abhijñānas, with her, was work of a very delicate character calling for the highest qualities of head and heart. It is not for nothing that the Poet has consecrated a whole kāṇḍa exclusively to Hanumān, though 'to a European taste,' in Griffith's words, the Sundara 'is the most intolerably tedious of the whole poem.' For an aesthetic appreciation of Sundarakāṇḍa it is not necessary to defend every line of it, to applaud every sentiment, to extol every simile; it is the *tout ensemble* that matters, and that is, that the story of Hanumān finding Sītā is something rich and rare. Not to speak of the priceless picture of night-rangers' life and manners which the Poet lets us see through the eyes of the 'laṅkā-praveśa-nava-nātaka-sūtradhāra' who raised the curtain over Laṅkā for just one night, he has shown us step by step from his monkey-hero's own lips how he went to work to find Sītā. It is hardly to be expected that a mind that is not *en rapport* with Hanumān's nirveda can sympathise with his finer feelings—ममापि व्यथितं मनः (V. xvi. 28), मम च प्रवणं मनः (V. lix. 2), or appreciate the beauty of 'the long and useless speeches' which in the eyes of the Western scholar 'impede the action of the poem.' This however by the way. What we are concerned with here is that the search for Sītā in the second stage was definitely not mass work but *individual work*, and work that required a high order of intellect and the utmost skill and circumspection. This was *Factor Number Four*.

Bearing these factors of the problem in mind, especially Factors Three and Four, that is, that the effective search for Sītā had to be carried out in *two stages*, the first by mass work and the second by individual work, let us see what Aṅgada's party could have done to carry out Sugrīva's command to search Laṅkā in particular.

द्वीपस्तस्यापरे पारे शतयोजनमायतः ।
अगम्यो मानुषैर्दीप्तस्तं मार्गध्वं समन्ततः ॥
तत्र सर्वात्मना सीता मार्गितव्या विशेषतः ।
स हि देशस्तु वध्यस्य रावणस्य दुरात्मनः ॥ IV. xli. 24-5

We shall assume that after searching the mainland the party had reached the shore of the southern sea well within the time limited by Sugrīva, that they had *not* met Sampāti, and that they

knew nothing of him. Their task was plain. Firstly, they had to cross to Laṅkā by air, in a body, and go over the island, a hundred yojanas in extent, सहिताः *i.e.* संघीभूताः, all together, with a tooth-comb, to find a fair captive answering to the description of Sītā. Secondly, they had to establish her identity and exchange tokens with her. Of these two stages, the second, *viz.* all that related to holding converse with Sītā, was individual work, work of an extremely difficult and delicate character that a multitude was unfitted for and that could properly be performed only by an individual member of the party. Such an individual the party possessed in Hanumān. Him had Sugrīva singled out for this part of the task—

तद्यथा लभ्यते सीता तत्त्वमेवोपपादय ॥
त्वय्येव हनुमन्स्वस्ति बलं बुद्धिः पराक्रमः ।
देशकालानुवृत्तिश्च नयश्च नयपण्डित ॥

IV. xliv. 6-7

and to him had Rāma entrusted the credentials—

ददौ तस्य ततः प्रीतः स्वनामाङ्कोपशोभितम् ।
अङ्गुलीयमभिज्ञानं राजपुत्र्याः परंतपः ॥
अनेन त्वां हरिश्रेष्ठ चिह्नेन जनकात्मजा ।
मत्सकाशादनुप्राप्तमनुद्विग्नानुपश्यति ॥

IV. xliv. 12-3

But what about the first stage of sītā-parimārgaṇa that had to precede it, *viz.* the discovery of a person answering to the description of Sītā, in Laṅkā? That was mass work. Was that practicable? It was carried out elsewhere, though with a negative result. It fact, Sītānveṣaṇa by the eastern, western, and southern divisions, the commanders of which had *not* been equipped with any credentials, conveniently came to an end with the first stage! But was it possible for the southern division to undertake the first stage of the search in Laṅkā, Rāvaṇa's own abode?

In the first place, for Aṅgada and his contingent of troops —a third of the entire vānara forces of Sugrīva, as we pointed out—to have invaded Laṅkā in a body to look for Sītā would have meant *war* with Rāvaṇa. Hanumān as a solitary intruder was, as we know, looked upon as but a spy, and Rāvaṇa deemed it beneath his dignity to take any notice of him; but even Hanumān had to fight in self-defence—

ततस्ते राक्षसाः प्राप्ता बलिनो युद्धकाङ्क्षिणः ।
रक्षणार्थं तु देहस्य प्रतियुद्धा मया रणे ॥

V. 1-15

How would Rāvaṇa have brooked an invasion by a host of monkeys? War was the certain result of such an invasion. The issue of such a war was uncertain. Even if the monkeys won, Rāvaṇa might baulk them of their object by hiding Sītā away where she could not be found. Rāma-kārya on which they had embarked might suffer serious if not irreparable damage. Rāma's reputation as the hero of Janasthāna would assuredly suffer hurt by this warfare of the monkeys. Above all, from the Poet's point of view, the artistic unity of the heroic poem would be marred by the tale of a ridiculous preliminary war between monkeys and rākṣasas in which the hero and the villain, the kāvya-nāyaka and pratināyaka, had no part.

Secondly, *could* Aṅgada and his army have invaded Laṅkā by air in a body? Sugrīva no doubt sent his generals with commissions to cross seas of vast distances. But while he meticulously informed them of the distances between various points to be touched in their voyages, he never mentioned to Aṅgada *how far* Laṅkā was from Mahendragiri. He only said that Laṅkā itself extended over a hundred yojanas, and for the rest told him that when he got to the shore of the southern sea, he and his advisers should decide for themselves what they had to do!

ततः समुद्रमासाद्य संप्रधार्यार्थनिश्चयम् ।

IV. xli. 20

It was from Sampāti, later, that Aṅgada and his party learnt that Laṅkā was fully a hundred yojanas off.

इतो द्वीपः समुद्रस्य संपूर्णे शतयोजने ।

IV. lviii. 20

No vānaras except Sugrīva himself, Vālin, Jāmbavān, 'calidus juventa,' in his 'hot youth', and Hanumān in his infancy had so far achieved such a long flight. The Poet has preserved for us the entries for this 'Long Jump Competition' (IV. lxv.), and we find that barring Aṅgada and Hanumān there was not one member of the party that could jump across to Laṅkā. In fact we have it from Hanumān that four individuals alone in the monkey world were capable of the feat—

चतुर्णामेव हि गतिर्वानराणां महात्मनाम् ।
वालिपुत्रस्य नीलस्य मम राज्ञश्च धीमतः ॥

V. ii. 30

though he names a few others in V. iii. 15-6.

So far as Laṅkā and the islands beyond were concerned, therefore, it was simply out of the question for the vānaras of Aṅgada's party to carry out systematically, and in a body, the first stage of the search as prescribed by Sugrīva, though they were well equipped to carry it out in its second stage. While the other three great divisions after a rapid yet thorough search of the east, west, and north, including the islands in those regions of the world, were able to report that Sītā was *not* to be found there, the southern division could not invade Laṅkā in a body without provoking a war, even if they could jump the intervening expanse of sea, and had thus no means whatever of finding out *whether Sītā was in the island or no*. Some means they had if they had applied to Agastya whom Sugrīva had directed them to visit at his seat on the top of Malaya to receive the sage's blessing.

तस्यासीनं नगस्याग्रे मलयस्य महौजसम् ।
द्रक्ष्यथादित्यसंकाशमगस्त्यमृषिसत्तमम् ॥
ततस्तेनाभ्यनुज्ञाताः प्रसन्नेन महात्मना ।

IV. xli. 16-17

The Poet who narrates the adventures of the southern party, as he does not of the other three parties, makes no mention of Aṅgada having met Agastya. The sage of course had more than one seat in the south, *e.g.* on the Kuñjara mountain (IV. xli. 35), and it is reasonable to suppose that he was away from Malaya when Aṅgada got to it. Of what use, then, would it be for Hanumān alone to go to Laṅkā on the off-chance of finding Sītā there? That was not what Sugrīva had contemplated. Suppose Sītā was not in Laṅkā but had been hidden away by Rāvaṇa in some rocky island fastness in the southern ocean, for instance, Puṣpitaka, a hundred yojanas on the other side of Laṅkā as Sugrīva had been careful to state, Sūryavān, fourteen yojanas beyond that, Vaidyuta further beyond, Kuñjara mentioned above, or the famed and impregnable city of Bhogavatī still further beyond, or Ṛṣabha guarded by the Rohitas right at the back of beyond, on the very confines

of Pitṛloka in fact, was Hanumān to visit these places in succession by himself, or was he to return to Mahendragiri from Laṅkā and report his unsuccess to Aṅgada and Jāmbavān? Hanumān himself was quite clear in his mind what he would do in such a contingency. On no account would he return to the mainland to report failure:—

सोऽहं नैव गमिष्यामि किष्किन्धां नगरीमितः ।
न च शक्ष्याम्यहं द्रष्टुं सुग्रीवं मैथिलीं विना ॥
मय्यगच्छति चेहस्थे धर्मात्मानौ महारथौ ।
आशया तौ धरिष्येते वानराश्च मनस्विनः ॥
सागरानूपजे देशे बहुमूलफलोदके ।
चितां कृत्वा प्रवेक्ष्यामि समिद्धमरणीसुतम् ॥

V. xiii. 38-9, 41

Presumably Hanumān would search the other islands by himself. Sugrīva's orders however were that Aṅgada should search all these islands *with* his followers till Sītā was found. Why, he had made the monkeys' mouths water, describing the joys of food and drink they were to regale themselves with in Vaidyuta island!

सर्वकामफलैर्वृक्षैः सर्वकालमनोहरैः ॥
तत्र भुक्त्वा वरार्हाणि मूलानि च फलानि च ।
मधूनि पीत्वा मुख्यानि परं गच्छत वानराः ॥

IV. xli. 33-4

How were they going to do it when they were incapable of taking the initial hop to Laṅkā?

It appears, then, that there was a grave lacuna in Sugrīva's plans for the search in Laṅkā and beyond. When after searching the mainland Aṅgada's band of vānaras found themselves on the shores of the southern sea, they would be faced with the formidable fact that while Hanumān and their leader[1] could

---

[1] Jāmbavān, 'the Odysseus of the expedition of Lanka' (De Gubernatis) would not let Angada, the Crown Prince, take the leap to Laṅkā

(भवान्कलत्रमस्माकं स्वामिभावे व्यवस्थितः ।
स्वामी कलत्रं सैन्यस्य गतिरेषा परंतप ॥
तस्मात्कलत्रवत्तात प्रतिपाल्यः सदा भवान् ।
and so forth, IV. lxv. 23ff.),

jump to Laṅkā the distance was too great for the main body's powers. This is to say, while the second stage of Sītānveṣaṇa in Laṅkā or in the islands beyond, which was *individual work, could* be carried out, it was simply impossible to accomplish the first stage which was an essential preliminary and was *mass work.*

Perhaps the lacuna was not unintentional. If we may make so bold as to take a peep into the Poet's workshop, we may perhaps find him thinking aloud somewhat in this strain:—" I cannot have a war—a ridiculous minor war between monkeys and demons—in Laṅkā without my hero, what will my kāvya look like? Any attempt therefore to make a search *en masse in Laṅkā* I must rigorously exclude. I will even make it impossible for any except the indispensable Hanumān with the signet ring to take the jump at all!" This line of thought will help us to see that that the considerations suggested above, *viz.* (i) the interests of Rāmakārya and the Mahākāvya, and (ii) the inability of the monkeys to jump to Laṅkā, are really interrelated and not independent.

To proceed with the main argument, suppose now that the party had met Agastya on Malaya peak, that Aṅgada had *asked* him for news of Sītā (Sugrīva had *not* bidden him ask, as he had expressly bidden Suṣeṇa ask Merusāvarṇi), and that the sage had told him that Sītā was in Laṅkā, the search for Sītā would at once be removed to the second stage and the matter simplified at one stroke. For, all that would remain to be done was for Hanumān to cross over with the credentials with which he had been equipped, use his intelligence to pick Sītā out, give Rāma's message and ring to her and bring back her cūḍāmaṇi and message. But just as for literary reasons the Poet felt bound to avoid a preliminary conflict in Laṅkā following its invasion by monkeys in a body, he would seem to have felt it incumbent upon him, consistently with the sentiments of his hero, to exclude all help from Agastya in the business of search.

---

any more than Lord Kitchener would sanction the Prince of Wales's going to the Front in the Great War, and for reasons similar to what Lord Kitchener gave, *viz.*, that it might not matter two pence if the Prince was annihilated by a German shell, but that he could not take any responsibility if he should fall into the hands of the Boche!

Here let us take another peep into the Poet's sanctum. *The Poet*: "Sugrīva of course must warn Aṅgada not to omit to pay his respects to Agastya when he searches the precincts of Malaya. But Rāma who has always refrained from troubling the holy men of Daṇḍaka with his affairs would not wish the sage to be applied to for a mere item of news as to Sītā's whereabouts. I must leave the Great One to come himself, when the time is ripe, hailing

राम राम महाबाहो श्रृणु गुह्यं सनातनम् ।

VI. cvii, 3

The monkeys must have no audience of him now; they shall therefore not find him in his seat in Malaya. Very well. But the next point is, that as I have made search in Laṅkā *en masse* out of the question and *impossible,* I must even make it *unnecessary*. I have made Sītānveṣaṇa by the other three divisions *end* with the first stage, *viz.*, the search *en masse*, for which alone they were equipped. I shall contrive means by which the search *in Laṅkā* may *begin* from the second stage, for which the southern division alone is equipped. To enable Aṅgada to dispense with the first stage, *viz.*, the search in a body ordered by Sugrīva, he shall have the assurance of an *eye-witness* that *Rāvaṇa and Sītā are actually in Rāvaṇa's house in Laṅkā*. Now, who so well-adapted for my purpose as a son of Vinatā's race, endued with keen sight with a range of a hundred yojanas? But he must not be a bird of passage, here to-day and gone to-morrow, or Aṅgada might not meet him except by a lucky accident. Let me see. Jaṭāyu, Śyenīputra, is dead, but his elder brother, Sampāti, whom Jaṭāyu had mentioned to Rāma (III. xiv. 33), and who he no doubt believed had been burnt up in that mad race of the brothers with the sun (IV. lviii. 4ff.), is still alive. He had burnt his wings, which is perhaps just as well, as by reason of it he is now stationary in his eyrie on Vindhya looking out on the southern ocean. He shall serve for a telescope. I will contrive that the vānaras shall resort to the vicinity of this 'observatory' in Vindhya. At the meeting with them Sampāti shall complete to Aṅgada the tale 'left half-told' to Rāma by Jaṭāyu with his last breath—

पुत्रो विश्रवसः साक्षाद्भ्राता वैश्रवणस्य च ।

III. lxviii. 16; and IV. lviii. 19

अध्यास्ते नगरीं लङ्कां रावणो नाम राक्षसः ॥

IV, lviii. 19

He shall testify to what he actually saw even while he was speaking

इतो द्वीपः समुद्रस्य संपूर्णे शतयोजने ।
तस्मिंल्लङ्कापुरी रम्या निर्मिता विश्वकर्मणा ॥
तस्यां वसति वैदेही दीना कौशेयवासिनी ।
रावणान्तःपुरे रुद्धा राक्षसीभिः सुरक्षिता ॥
इहस्थोऽहं प्रपश्यामि रावणं जानकीं तथा ।

IV. lviii. 20, 22, 29

And for his Rāmakaiṅkarya

वाङ्मात्रेण तु रामस्य करिष्ये साह्यमुत्तमम् ॥

IV. lviii. 12

Sampāti shall, in fulfilment of an ancient prophecy of Sage Niśākara, there and then regain his wings by a miracle occurring before the very eyes of the vānaras, so that he might say to Jāmbavān—to adapt the words of Maināka to Hanumān (Campū, Sundara, 5)— तस्मात्पूर्वं विपक्षोऽपि सपक्ष इति मां भज—and Jāmbavān and Aṅgada and Hanumān might be assured of the truth of Sampāti's testimony. The romantic tale I have in mind of Svayamprabhā's cave of illusion where the vānaras shall forget their quest and lose count of time shall show that indiscretion sometimes serves us well!"

Sampāti-vacana, then, did exactly what the imaginary Agastya-vacana would have accomplished, that is, informed Aṅgada and the other leaders that Sītā was of a surety in Laṅkā. This was of tremendous significance. It decisively dispensed with the first stage of Sītā-parimārgana *in* Laṅkā, *i.e.*, with the necessity for the search party to go in a body to look if Sītā was in Laṅkā or not; and as that stage has been shown to be impossible of execution, the search which by reason thereof might have languished on the hither side of the ocean received a fresh impetus. At the same time it did not do away with the second stage, as was made clear by Hanumān

संपातिवचनाच्चापि रामं यद्यानयाम्यहम् ।
अपश्यन्राघवो भार्यां निर्दहेत्सर्ववानरान् ॥

V. xiii. 53

It enabled the great vānara leaders, thanks to their indiscretion, to proceed at once with the second stage, *viz.*, the meeting of Sītā face to face and the exchange of messages and abhijñānas which it was possible for an individual member of the party and only for him to accomplish.

Such seems to be the true import of 'Sampāti-vacana'. If Sampāti was not real—and Brahma's words

न ते वागनृता काव्ये काचिदत्र भविष्यति ।

I. ii. 35

preclude the idea—he was *ben trovato.*

ON A MEANING OF THE WORD KAUŚIKA

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

In Artha Śāstra XI. i. (p, 380, Mysore II edn.), on Saṅghavṛtta or affairs of the republics of merchants (vārttopajīvins), soldiers (śastropajīvins) and others assuming the title of king (Rājaśabdopajīvins), Kauṭilya has occasion to speak of methods employed to create split or to do away secretly with unwanted persons; and among persons who could be easily employed for such plots, Kauṭilya mentions many classes of men and woman engaged in artistic and other persuits and moving closely with those in power as part of their retinue. We find here the following—

कौशिकस्त्रियो नर्तकी गायना वा प्रतिपन्नान् गूढवेश्मसु रात्रिसमागमप्रविष्टाः तीक्ष्णाः हन्युर्बध्वा हरेयुर्वा ।

(p. 380)

The danseuse and the songstress here are clearly understood, but who are the *Kauśika-striyaḥ* of the same category whom Kauṭilya mentions here?

Mm. Dr. Shama Sastri translates Kauśika-striyaḥ as harlots (p. 439 of his English translation); but this meaning, conjectured on the basis of the sense of the context, seems to be too wide of the mark.

Mm. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri reads the text here as आदितिकौशिकास्त्रियः in his edition of the Artha Śāstra in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, and gives the following explanation in his commentary:

अदितयो नानादेवालेख्यप्रदर्शनवृत्तयः स्त्रियः । कौशिकस्त्रियः व्यालग्राहिस्त्रियश्च ।

That is, Aditi-strī is a woman going about exhibiting pictures of several deities[1] and Kauśika-strī, a woman snake-charmer.

---

[1] On Picture-Showmen in Ancient India, *Sec* Coomaraswam *IHQ*. V. 182-187; my note, *IHQ* XII. p. 524.

The reading *Aditi-kauśika-striyaḥ* is the one adopted by Mādhavayajvan in his Nayacandrikā on the Artha Śāstra; but the meaning given by Mādhavayajvan is not in complete agreement with Mm. Ganapati Sastri's.

" अदितिकौशिकस्त्रियः इति । अदितिकौशिकदेवतालेख्यध्वजेन भिक्षमाणानां योगपुरुषाणां....... ।"

Madras Ms. R. No. 2403. p. 233.
Lahore edn. p. 208.

Though, unfortunately, there is a gap in the text of the Nayacandrikā here, we can make out Mādhavayajvan's idea; according to him, both Aditi and Kauśika refer to pictures of deities of those names and the women meant here by Kauṭilya are wives of Yogapuruṣas or secret agents in the guise of beggers carrying these pictures of deities and begging alms. But how such beggars could get private engagements in secret places during nights with the persons they have planned to do away with or carry away is really difficult to understand.

It appears to me that the reading in XI. i Aditi-kauśika-striyaḥ' adopted by Mādhavayajvan is an instance of an erroneous repetition, and that the correct reading here is 'Kauśikastriyaḥ' without the word Aditi, as found in the Mysore edn. The earlier passage on which this wrong repetition in XI. i. is likely to be based occurs in I. xvi, Rājaputrarakṣaṇa, where we find

"तस्मान् मातृबन्धुषु वासः श्रेयान् इति । 'ध्वजस्थानमेतद्' इति । तेन हि ध्वजेन अदितिकौशिकवदस्य मातृबान्धवा भिक्षेरन् ।

p. 33. Mysore 2nd edn,

Kauṭilya is discussing in this chapter the question of the bringing up of the prince who is the next claimant to the throne and is likely to develop enmity towards his own father. Different writers suggest different places where he could be sent away to be brought up by others, and the defect of each suggestion is pointed out. One suggestion is that the prince may be left with his mother's kinsmen but, as against this suggestion, it is said that the mother's relatives may use him as a pretext to beg of the king monies for themselves; and as an analogy for such begging, the text mentions here 'Aditi-kauśika' as beggars using '*Dhvaja*'. What this Dhvaja is we do not know

exactly. When Mādhavayajvan came upon, in the later context in XI. i., the expression 'Kauśika-striyaḥ', his mind at once remembered the earlier passage in I. xvi 'Dhvajena Aditi-Kauśikavad Bhikṣeran' and he made out the sense in the light of that earlier passage, namely that the words Aditi, Kauśika, and Dhvaja, signified banners painted with deities and exhibited by beggars while asking for alms. The text itself in XI, i must have been changed wrongly into *Aditi*—Kauśika-striyaḥ on the basis of the earlier Aditi-kauśikavat.

On the earlier passage unfortunately we do not have the commentary of Mādhavayajvan; but we have the Jayamaṅgalā on this portion of the text, and it is to the Jayamaṅgalā that Mm. Ganapati Sastri owes his interpretation of Aditi as picture showing beggar and Kauśika as snake-charmer.[1] The Jayamaṅgalā says here :

"अदितिकौशिकवत् । यो देवताप्रतिमा....याभिक्षणं कुर्यादित्यदितिरुच्यते । कौशिकोऽहितुण्डिकः व्यालग्राहिक इत्यर्थः । तदुभयमपि देवतामहिं च ध्वजीकृत्य नादानाभ्यां तत्प्रसादकोपादिशन् (?) लोकं भिक्षेत ।

Madras Ms. R. 5208, p. *79.*

According to this commentary, Aditi alone exhibits a figure of god while begging; Kauśika is a snake-charmer; the point in mentioning two kinds of beggars is that the mother's relatives who use the prince to extract gifts from the royal exchequer may adopt a peaceful method of request like the god-exhibiting Aditi or frighten the king to part with gifts like a snake-charmer using a snake. As the expression Dhvaja, in this interpretation, is common to both varieties of begging, we have to understand by Kauṭilya's *Dhvaja* no painted banner, but only 'pretext' which is an accepted meaning of that word; even in the case of Aditi, it is doubtful if any painted banner is meant, for the Jayamaṅgalā uses only the expression 'Devatā-pratimā.' 'Snake-charmer' is one of the well-known meanings of the word Kauśika given by lexicons.[2] As Mādhvayajvan's

---

[1] Dr. Shama Sastri does not translate the words Aditi and Kauśika here !

[2] Some lexicons give among the several meanings of the word Kauśika, Vyālagrāhi or snake-charmer, and also the meaning Nakula or ichneumon. Probably the first alone, snake-catcher

interpretation simply works upon the words *Dhvaja* and *Bhikṣā* in the earlier passage, and as there is no agreement between him and the author of the Jayamaṅgalā, and as, according to my suggestion, the addition of the word Aditi to Kauśika-striyaḥ in XI. i may be an accretion due to Aditi-kauśikavat in I. xvi, we might try to seek independently for any other reasonable and relevant meaning of the word Kauśika in Kauṭilya XI. i.

As observed already, it is somewhat difficult to understand how such beggars could have occassion to enjoy the private company of important persons. In the drama Mudrārākṣasa, we do see a picture-beggar, Yama-paṭṭika, and a snake-charmer, Āhituṇḍika, figuring as spies, getting unsuspected access to *house-fronts* and gathering important information; but the intimate and private access meant by Kauṭilya in the passage in XI. i is different. The important persons meant to be done away with or decoyed are allured to secret places in the night to enjoy the company of these women. The entire chapter is full of references to women practising the arts of music, dance etc., and given to a life of easy virtue, being used as such agents of political plotting; and it is such women who can have easy and unsuspected access to and intimacy with important persons. Does the word Kauśika-strī have any meaning signifying a woman of such a description, who could go naturally with the two others mentioned along with her, the Nartakī and Gāyanā?

In the Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa, we have the character of an elderly woman in yellow robes, Parivrājikā, a Hindu lady recluse,[1] who is otherwise called Paṇḍita *Kauśikī* or Ārya *Kauśikī*[2]. We find her such an expert in the art of dance that the king and queen accept her as the judge in the dance contest;[3] when the queen is lying with a broken leg, she

---

or snake-charmer was originally included among the Anekārthas of Kauśika. Later, by a process of further secondary homonymical extension, Vyālagrāhi was taken to mean the well-known enemy of the snake, ichneumon, and Kauśika itself made to comprehend that animal too among its meanings.

[1] See I. 14.

[2] Act V.

[3] Acts I and II.

entertains her with stories[1]; later she exhibits her knowledge of the medical lore when the Vīdūṣaka is said to be smitten by a snake;[2] and finally the queen asks her to show her great proficiency in the art of dressing by getting up Mālavikā in the Vaidarbha style of marriage dress;[3] and, all the time, she was showing also her proficiency in advancing the love affair of the king and Mālavikā.[4] From this we gather that there was a class or community of persons which specialised in the arts of song, dance, toilette, (Sairandhrīkarman), love-affairs, etc., members of which were in the employ of kings and nobles, with whom they enjoyed great confidence. And the name *Kauśikī* by which this character is known in the Mālavikāgnimitra signifies the name of such a community.

On this, we shall now seek some light from Tamil literature: In the Tamil epic Śilappadikāram of Iḷaṅgo, in canto XIII called Puraṁceriyiruttakādai, we find the poet continuing the description of the journey of Kovalan and Kaṇṇaki, in the company of Kavundi, towards the city of Madura. They cross a forest in the Pāṇḍyan territory in the moonlit night, and at dawn reach a Brāhman village near Madura, which is described as follows by the poet:

வரி நவில் கொள்கை மறைநூல் வழுக்கத்துப்
புரிநூன் மார்பருறை பதிச் சேர்ந்து

lines 38, 39

a village of Brāhmans who had fallen away from their study of the Vedas and were practising the art of music. The author of the gloss Arumpadavurai says that these Brāhmans were also called *Ambaṇavas.* Later, Kovalan is said to join these Brāhman musicians (பாடும்-பாணர்) of that village who were singing of *Antarī* (Durgā) to the accompaniment of Śeṅkoṭṭiyāḻ, a lute of that name.[5] Here again, the Arunpadavurai says that the expression 'Pāḍum Pāṇar' means 'Ambaṇavar' and the Śeṅkoṭṭiyāḻ is the yāḻ or lute of the Ambaṇavars.

---

1 Act IV.

2 Act IV.

3 Act V.

4 The Vidūṣaka calls her a Pīṭhamardikā in Act I, on her very first appearance.

5 Lines 105 ff.

In the same context, we are told that, Kauśikan, who is introduced abruptly, met Kovalan, delivered to him a love-message given by his erstwhile beloved courtezan Mādhavi, and went back to the city of Puhār to deliver that message to Kovalan's parents. From the description it appears that this Kauśika, also mentioned as Kośika, was a resident of Puhār city and that he went to console Mādhavi in her separation and took from her that message to Kovalan. The text mentions him once as Kauśikan (line 47) and thrice as Kośikamāni (lines 53, 56, 99). The Arumpadavurai says on line 47—

கவுசிகன்—கோசிக கோத்திரத்தான்; பெயருமாம். இவன் மாதவி கடையாயினனோர் அந்தணன்—

that this Kauśika was a Brāhman attached to Mādhavi, *that Kauśikan means that he was of the Kauśika gotra, or perhaps it was his proper name.* This remark shows that the author of the gloss is not sure of the significance of this name Kauśika. That it cannot be his proper name is borne out by his being introduced abruptly and referred to thrice afterwards as Kauśikamāni, an expression similar to Devāra-māni, and meaning a Kauśika Brahmacāri or student. The second commentator Aḍiyārkkunallār interprets this Kośikan as *Bandi* Kośikan or *Vandi* Kośikan *i.e,,* a minstrel. It is clear from this that Kauśika is a common name of persons devoted to music and the arts and also serving as aids and messengers in love-affairs. Though this Kauśikan was a native of the city of Puhār, and though as the Arumpadavurai suggests, he might be attached to Mādhavi, we must note the special significance of his search for Kovalan fructifying in a village of Brāhmans who were, like himself, fallen from their real Brāhmanic status,[1] and were engaged in the pursuit of music. Having wandered in search of Kovalan, this Kauśika had come to that Brāhman village and was staying there, as it must have been natural and convenient for him to do so among persons of his own persuasion.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara I. 179 (Kumbhakonam edn.), we have in the midst of a description of the ærial way across

---

[1] On Brāhmaṇs falling in status through their pursuit of the arts, Śilpa, see Manu III. 64, शिल्पेन व्यवहारेण etc.

which Hanumān was speeding, the words चरिते कैशिकाचार्यैः। Govindarāja says that as Kaiśika is the name of a Rāga, we have to understand by Kaiśikācāryas, musicians of Vidyādhara class who move about in the skies.

कैशिके रागविशेषे आचार्यैः विद्याधरविशेषैः इत्यर्थः ।

Tilaka takes Kaiśika as signifying the arts of music and dance and Kaiśikācāryas as Gandharvas like Tamburu.

कैशिकं गाननृत्यविद्या, तदाचार्यैः तुम्बुरुप्रभृतिगन्धर्वैः ।

Kataka interprets Kaiśika as music:

कैशिकं गानविद्या । तदाचार्यास्तुम्बुरुप्रमुखाः गन्धर्वाः ।

The commentary which I identify as Uḍāli's[1] says that Kaiśika is both a type of dance and a style of playing the sword, and that Kaiśikācāryas are Vidyādharas.

कैशिक इति नृत्तविशेषश्च खड्गमार्गे विशेषश्च । तत्राचार्या कैशिकाचार्याः, ते च विद्याधरवरिष्ठाः ।

Kaiśika as a Rāga and as a variety of the Niṣādasvara is well-known in music; as a style of dancing and of playing the sword too, it is well-known in Nāṭya Śāstra as one of the four Vṛttis[2]. In all these interpretations, the word Kaiśika is to be taken as having been used as an Upalakṣaṇa for music and dance. It may be mentioned here that in both the Eastern recension edited by Gorresio (Vol. IV. p. 171, śl. 59) and in the N. Western recension edited from Lahore (Kiṣ. 62.40) 'Kaiśikācārya' is found as *'Kauśikācārya'*.[3] If Kauśika is the correct word here, we have to relate it to the word and meaning we have been discussing so far; and as Kauśika means a community of musicians, we have to understand it here in a secondary sense again, as the reference is to the celestial musicians like Gandharvas flying in the skies.

From this examination, we may interpret *Kauśika-striyaḥ* in Kauṭilaya XI. i as women of a class or community devoted to the arts of music, dance, toilette etc., employed in courts, and engaged frequently in aiding love-affairs.

---

[1] See my article in the *Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras*, Vol. VI, pt. 2.

[2] See my article on Vṛttis, *JOR.*, Madras, Vol. VII, pp. 34-6.

[3] In fact in all its senses, according to lexicons, Kaiśika has the variant form Kauśika.

NANDIVARMAN II PALLAVAMALLA

Date of Accession Reconsidered.

N. Venkataramanayya, M.A., PH.D.

In a paper contributed to the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras (*JOR*. VIII. pp. 1-8), I examined the problem of the date of accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla and arrived at the conclusion that he ascended the throne in A.D. 726 and ruled until A.D. 791. Certain facts which have come to my notice since the publication of that article, though they show that the period indicated is roughly accurate, render the reconsideration of the problem necessary. The first point that deserves mention here is a definite date for Narasimhavarman II, which may be described as the sheet-anchor of the chronology of the later Pallava kings of Kāñcī, furnished by Ts'o Fou Yuan Kouei, 'a Chinese encyclopædia compiled about A.D. 1013.' According to one of the passages in the work, "in the eighth year of K'ai-yuen (720), the King of the kingdom of South India, Che-li Na-lo-seng-kia (Śrī Narasimha), proposed to employ his war elephants and his cavalry to chastise the Ta-che (Arabs) as well as the T'ou-po (Tibetans) and others." Who this Śrī Narasimha was, is explained in another passage of the same work. "In the 11th month (of the 8th year of K'ai-yuen), an ambassador was sent to confer by brevet the title of the king of the kingdom of the South India, Che-li-Na-lo-seng-kia pao-to-pa-mo (Śrī Narasimha Pōtavarman.)" In addition to the information furnished by these two passages, *Kieou T'ang Chou* gives the following under the same year (720). "The 9th month, the king of South India, Che-li-Na-lo-seng-k'ia-to-pa (Śrī Narasimha Pōtavarman) constructed a temple on account of the empire (*i.e.*, of China); he addressed to the emperor a request asking from him an inscription giving a name to this temple; by decree, it was decided that the name should be 'which causes return to virtue' (Koei-hoa) and it was presented to him (*i.e.*, the emperor sent Narasimha a tablet with the inscription *Koei-hoa se*, so that it might be placed on the front of the temple erected in India by Narasimha for the benefit of China)."[1] It is evident from these

---

[1] K. A. Nilakanta Sastri: Foreign Notices of South India, Madras University Historical Series, No. 14, pp. 116-17.

extracts that Narasimha Pōtavarman *i.e.*, the Pallava king Narasimhavarman II, was ruling in A.D. 720. How long he continued to rule after this date, it is not possible to ascertain in the present state of our knowledge. For the convenience of the present discussion, A.D. 720 may be taken as the last year of the reign of Narasimhavarman II. Parmēśvaravarman II, who succeeded him, ruled only for a short period. As the only known record of his reign is dated in his 3rd regnal year[1], his reign must have lasted at least until A.D. 723. The reign of Paramēśvarman II, however ended in a great disaster. The Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil inscription of Pallavamalla gives a graphic account of the condition of the Pallava kingdom after the death of Paramēśvaravarman II. It is stated that Paramēśvara Pōttaraiyar of the Pallava family, descending (in unbroken succession) from the God Brahmā, having departed to *Svarga*, the kingdom fell into ruin[2]. There was none to rule the people, and the country was plunged in anarchy. Therefore, 'a deputation of the *mātras*, the *mūlaprakṛtis*, and the *ghaṭikayār* waited on Hiraṇyavarman Mahārāja, and represented the fact that the country was without a ruler and requested him to grant them a soveriegn. Thereupon king Hiraṇyavarman sent for the chief potentates (*kulamallar*) and enquired which among them would accept sovereignty. *All of them refusing*, he asked his sons Śrīmalla, Raṇamalla, Sangrāmamalla, and Pallavamalla. Pallavamalla humbly offered, but king Hiraṇyavarman was at first *unwilling to risk his own son*, who was then only twelve years of age, in such a perilous undertaking. But Hiraṇyavarman was soon persuaded by Dharaṇikoṇḍa Pōśar to give his consent.'[3] It is evident from this that the election of Nandivarman Pallavamalla did not immediately follow the death of Paramēśvaravarman II but after an interval of anarchy and confusion, the duration of which cannot be definitely ascertained at present. This is corroborated by the evidence of the sculptures in the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil at Kāñcī illustrating the history of the Pallava dynasty. Between the panels representing the coronations of Paramēśvaravarman II and Nandivarman Pallavamalla, there intervenes a panel left purposely blank by the sculptors. "We have", says Dr. C. Minakshi, "a further

---

1 56 of 1903.
2 SII. IV. no. 133.
3 EI. xviii, p. 123*f*.

proof of this (anarchy), in the blank space which occupies this wall next to the coronation of Nandivarman. We learn that the Pallava kingdom experienced total anarchy after the death of Paramēśvara, and nothing could represent this condition better than a blank space."[1] Though it is not possible to discover when exactly Nandivarman II Pallavamalla was chosen as the king of Kāñcī, it is certain that this event took place sometime before A.D. 733. According to an interesting passage in the Udayēndiram plates, dated in the 21st year of Pallavamalla, his commander Udayacandra 'pursued and defeated the Niṣāda chief named Pṛthvīvyāghra who was running after the *aśvamēdha* horse in the north; made Viṣnurāja's country Pallava territory (*i.e.*, he conquered Viṣṇurāja's country and annexed it to the Pallava kingdom); and having brought Niravadya and others under his control, took (from them) beautiful necklaces, large quantities of gold and elephants."[2] Viṣṇurāja, mentioned in this passage, is identical with the Eastern Cāḷukya king, Viṣṇuvardhana, very probably the third of that name[3]; and Niravadya with the Western

---

[1] Historical Sculptures in the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil at Kāñcī, p. 32.

[2] SII. II. p. 368. ll. 55-59. l. 55. [*Uttararasyām* 1. 56 *api disi Pṛthvī-Vyāghr=abhidhā* [*na**] *n=Niṣa*) *da-patiṁ prabalāya mānam=aśva·nē l.* 57. *dha-turangam=*[*ā**] *nusaraṇam=ipa taṁ =anusrtya vijitya-viṣayāt=Pa l.* 58. *llasātkṛṭya=ādisan= Niravadya-pramukhān śuhārān aparimita-suvarṇa-saṁca-yaṁ kuñjarān=api yō jagraha*] The passage as corrected by Dr. V. Raghavan runs as follows:—"*Uttarasyām=api diśi Pṛthvī-Vyāghrābhidhānam Niṣāda-patim prapalāyamānam=aśvāmēdha-turangam=ānusaraṇam=api tam=anusṛtya vijitya Viṣṇurāja-viṣayān Pallava sātkṛtya ādiśan=Niravadya-pramukhān suhārān=aparimita-suvarṇa-saṁcayaṁ kuñjarān=api yo jagrāha.*

[3] The chronology of the early Eastern Cālukya kings is not yet settled. The scheme of chronology suggested by late Dr. Fleet (IA. xx. pp. 1, 93, 206) is antiquated; and the dates suggested by him either for Viṣṇuvardhana III or Viṣṇuvardhana IV cannot be accepted. With the help of the chronological data, collected since the publication of Fleet's articles, Messrs. B. V. Krishna Rao (JAHRS. ix. pp. 1-32) and M. Somasekhara Sarma (JOR. x. pp. 27-45) formulated fresh schemes of the Eastern Cālukya chronology. Though the new schemes are undoubtedly an improvement on Fleet's preliminary attempt, neither of them is free from difficulties and cannot in their entirety be accepted without

Cāḷukya Vijayāditya, who ruled until A.D. 733.[1] An inscription at Annavaram in the Darsi division of the present Nellore district, shows that the authority of the Cālukya kings of Bādāmi was acknowledged in the south of the coastal Telugu country.[2] There can be little doubt that Niravadya from whom Udayacandra wrested jewels, gold and elephants in the course of his northern campaign was the Western Cāḷukya king Vijayāditya. It follows from this that Nandivarman II who had been elected the king of the Pallavas sometime before this date was ruling at the time. His accession to the throne must therefore be assigned to some date between A.D. 723 and 733. A casual statement found in some Western Ganga grants of the closing years of the 8th century A.D., which has an indirect bearing on the subject, must be taken up for consideration in this context. In the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates of Yuvarāja Mārasimha, son of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, dated A.D. 797 and 799 respectively, it is stated that "by the ornaments of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava lines, the crowned kings named Gōvindarāja and Nandivarmmā, was he anointed to the kingdom, they with their own hands binding the crown on his brow,—the sun, to the clear firmament of the Ganga line, Kongaṇi Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara Śivamāra-Dēva."[3] Before proceeding to point out the bearing of this statement on the date of the accession of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, it is necessary to settle the identity of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava monarchs, who bound with their own hands the

---

reserve. According to Mr. Krishna Rao, Viṣṇuvardhana III ruled from A.D. 719 to 755, and Viṣṇuvardhana IV from A.D. 772 to 898. Mr. Sarma, however, assigns Viṣṇuvardhana III to A.D. 727 to 763 and Viṣṇuvardhana IV to A.D. 780 to 814.

[1] That Vijayāditya was known by the title of Niravadya is evident from the following passage in the Paṭṭaḍakal inscription [E. I. III, p. 47] of his grandson Kīrtivarman III:—

'*Sūrya-sutaṁ=iva dānaratas=sadā Vṛkōdaram=iva sāhasa-rasikaḥ Śrī-niravady=ōdāra Vijayāditya-Satrāśraya Pṛthvī-Vallabha Mahārāja-Paramēśvara Parama-bhaṭṭārekēna.* The terms *niravady-=ōdāra* are reminiscent of the expressions "*udāratvān=niravad-yatvād*" used in the Kendur and the Vakkalēri plates to describe the liberality and the irreproachable conduct of Vijayāditya (EI. ix. p. 200, v, p. 200).

[2] 183 of 1933-4.

[3] EC. ix. Nl. 60, MAR 1924, no. 80.

crown on the brow of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa at the time of his coronation.

First, about Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja:—Of the four kings of the name of Gōvindarāja mentioned in the genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkhed embodied in their inscriptions, the first and the last may be left out of consideration, as the former is too early and latter too late to have been a contemporary of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa. The remaining two, Gōvinda II (A.D. 772-780), and Govinda III (A.D. 794-813) were certainly his contemporaries. Now, the question is which of these two is the Gōvindarāja, who together with Pallava Nandivarmınā participated in Śivamāra's coronation and placed the crown upon his head. Although it is generally believed that it is Gōvinda III who joined Pallavamalla in crowning him, the validity of this belief has been called into question by Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma; he is of opinion that the Ganga king Śrīpuruṣa, the father of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, after a rule of fifty years, was killed in battle in A.D. 775 by Kāḍuveṭṭi of Kāñcī; that after his death, the succession to the Ganga throne was disputed by his sons Duggamāra and Śivamāra Saigotta; that 'apprehending danger from the common enemy Dhruva who, gradually gaining power in the north, was intending to invade the southern kingdoms, both Nandivarman Pallavamalla of Kāñcī and Gōvinda II took advantage of the situation in the Ganga kingdom, and, in order to strengthen their own position, began to take an interest in the Ganga affairs; and that 'they both, espousing the cause of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, who was perhaps the eldest son of Śrīpuruṣa, anointed him heir to the Ganga kingdom,' and helped him actively to overthrow Duggamāra."[1] This view is open to serious objections. In the first place, there is no evidence to show that Śrīpuruṣa was killed in A.D. 775 or at any other time in a battle with Kāḍuveṭṭi of Kāñci. The Kuldikki epigraph, dated in the 52nd year of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, on the authority of which Mr. Sarma assumes the death of Śrīpuruṣa in a battle with Kāḍuveṭṭi in A.D. 775, does not support his contention. 'It records,' as stated by the epigraphist, 'the death of Gangadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇāḍu Perungangar, the chief of Kaṟkāṭṭūr, who, at the instance of *māmaḍi*, the Bāṇa king, fell on the day, when the

[1] 'A Miscellany of Papers, Publislied in honour of the late Rao Saheb G. Rāmamūrti Pantulu), pp. 119-120, 127-8.

Pallava army marched against Perumānaḍigal, and destroyed (the fortress of) Penukuḻikoṭṭai."[1] It is obivous that G. K. Perungangar, the petty chief of Kaṟkāṭṭūr (Kaḷakāṭṭūr in the Palamneri taluk of the Chittoor district) was a subordinate of the Bāṇa ruler, and the fact that he, at the instance of his overlord, attempted to check the advance of the Pallava army on Perumānaḍigal and perished in the attempt, does not offer any justification for identifying him with Perumānaḍigal himself. G. K. Perungangar, as pointed out by me elsewhere, was a third party;[2] and Perumānaḍigal was in fact the liege-lord and sovereign of his overlord, the Bāṇa chief, who ordered him to proceed against the Pallava army and arrest their progress. That Śrīpuruṣa did not die in A.D. 775, but was alive for more than a decade after that year is shown by an inscription of his reign dated Śaka 710 (A.D. 788).[3] As it was not usual for kings to celebrate their coronation during the life time of their predecessors, it may be presumed that the coronation of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa did not take place until after the death of his father in A.D. 788 or later. Therefore, Gōvinda II whose reign came to an end in A.D. 780 or 781 could not have been the Gōvindarāja who joined Pallava Nandivarmmā in celebrating his coronation. Nor had Gōvinda II any share in the overthrow of Duggamāra. According to verse 24 of the Jethwai plates of Šīla Mahādēvi, the chief queen of Dhruva, dated A.D. 786, Dhruva conquered Durga who had all the strength of the three worlds, and augmented his fame by imprisoning the entire Ganga family, and appropriated for himself the prosperity of (a ruler) whose insignia was the bull; he alone displayed in this world the quality of Paramēśvara (supreme ruler) clearly and powerfully, just as Śiva etc.[4] Moreover, the evidence of the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates clearly shows that it was not

---

[1] ARE. 145 of 1921, EI. xxii, No. 18, p. 110.

[2] JOR. viii. p. 5 n.3.

[3] Rep. Mys. Arch. Dept. 1918, p. 42. It is true that in this record 'no royal titles are attached,' as pointed out by Mr. Sarma, "to the name of Śrīpuruṣa." (A Miscellany of Papers p. 120) There is nothing exceptional in this. Several records of Śrīpuruṣa, in which he is referred to without any titles are known; and there is nothing in the present record to show that Śrīpuruṣa mentioned in it was a subordinate and not the king himself.

[4] EI. xxii. No. 17, pp. 98-109.

Gōvinda II, but his nephew Gōvinda III who crowned Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa. Both the records refer at first to his victory over the Vallabha army, supported by Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Cāḷukya, Haihaya, and other leaders at Muduguṇḍūr; then they allude to the defeat of the powerful cavalry of Dhōra (Dhruva); and mention finally his coronation, when he was crowned by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja and Pallava Nandivarmmā.[2] It is obvious that Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja referred to in these records could not have been Gōvinda II, the elder brother of Dhruva, but his son and successor, Gōvinda III.

Second, about Pallava Nandivarmmā:—Opinion also is divided about the identity of the Pallava king Nandivarmmā, mentioned in the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates. Though he is generally taken to have been identical with Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar contends that he was not

---

Yo='sau prasādhita-jagat-traya-sāra Durgō
Gaṁg-augha-santati-nirōdha-vivṛddha-kīrtiḥ|
Ātmīkṛt=ōnnata-Vṛṣāṅka-vibhūtir=uccair=
Yatkaṁ tatāna Paramēśvaratāṁ=ih=aikaḥ||

Dr. D.R. Bhaṇḍārkar's rendering of this verse is quite unsatisfactory and misleading; unsatisfactory, because, he misses the historical information conveyed by the expression, *prasādhita-jagat-traya-sāra-durgo* by translating it as 'he reduced to subjection forts (*durga*) which were the cream of the three worlds;' and misleading because he states that *Vṛṣāṅka* was the Eastern Cāḷukya king. Commenting on this verse, he says, 'the second historical fact to be deduced from the same verse of our grant is that he made his own the prosperity of a ruler whose family insignia was the bull. Who could this prince be? Obviously he could be no other than a prince of the (Eastern) Cāḷukya family of Vengi who had the bull as their badge. And this prince again could be no other than his father-in-law, Viṣṇuvardhana IV." (p. 104). This, in cold print, from the pen of a scholar and historian of the eminence of Dr. Bhandarkar, is quite astounding! Still more astounding is the silence of the editors of Epigraphia India, who never let go an opportunity to enlighten the scholarly public by their illuminating observations. It is common knowledge of all the students of South Indian history that the 'boar' (*varāha*) was the badge of all the branches of the Cāḷukya family including the Eastern Cāḷukyas of Vengi, and the bull (*vṛṣa*) the badge of the Pallavas of Kāñcī.

2 EC. ix. N1. 60, MAR. 1924, No. 80.

Pallavamalla, but his grandson Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu. He is led to this conclusion by his interpretation of the data about the chronology of the later Pallava soveriegns. He starts with A.D. 888, the date on which Āditya I overthrew Aparājita and established the Cōḷa monarchy, and proceeds to calculate backwards with the help of the regnal years furnished by the later Pallava inscriptions. As the latest regnal year found in Aparājita's records is 18, he arrives, by deducting 18 from 888, at A.D. 870 as the first year of his reign. His predecessor, Nṛpatunga ruled for 26 years; and the initial date of his reign is placed in (870—26=) 844. Here he encounters his first hurdle. As the latest regnal year quoted in the inscriptions of Nṛpatunga's father and predecessor, Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu, is 22, he must have commenced to rule according to Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar's computation, in (844—22=) 822 A.D. This, however, he is not able to accept, as he has to accommodate an inconvenient fact, *viz.*, the synchronism of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja and Pallava Nandivarmmā, mentioned in the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates. As the latest regnal year found in the inscriptions of Dantivarman, the father and predecessor of Nandivarman III, is 51, his initial year must be placed in (822-51=) 771 A.D. and this leaves no Nandivarman who could have been a contemporary of Gōvinda III. To get over this difficulty, Mr. Subrhmanya Aiyer lengthens the reign of Nandivarman III by ten years, and takes it back to A.D. 812. As the last known date of Gōvinda III is A.D. 814, the cornonation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa in which Gōvinda III and Nandivarman participated may be conveniently assigned to the period 812-14. "The latest regnal year found for him (Nandivarman III) in his inscriptions mentioning the victory of Teḷḷāṟu," says he, "is 22. But there is a possibility of his having reigned longer. If he had a reign of 22 years, his accession would have to be placed in A.D. 822. This cannot be the case, for, we learn from the Western Ganga grants that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Gōvinda III and the Pallava King Nandivarman—both crowned kings themselves—fastened the fillet of royalty on the forehead of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭta. The last year of Gōvinda III being A.D. 814, this event should have occured before that date, say about A.D. 812. Accordingly, we have to take back the year of accession of Nandivarman III by ten years."[1] Apart from the arbitrary

[1] EI. xx. No. 3, pp. 49-50.

character of this procedure, there is another important fact militating against Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyer's view, which he seems to have overlooked. The coronation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa, according to his chronological scheme, must have taken place between A.D. 812 and 814; but the Maṇṇe and the Ālūr plates, the only records which refer to this event, are dated, as noticed already, in A.D. 797 and 799 respectively. It cannot he said that the authors of these charters foretold an event which was still in the womb of the future. Therefore, the coronation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa must have taken place sometime before A.D. 797 and not between A.D. 812 and 814, as Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer would have us believe. As Dantivarman, the father and predecessor of Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu, was, as shown by the Rāmēśvaram grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III, ruling in Kāncī in A.D. 803[1], he could not have been the *Mūrdhābhiṣikta* Pallava Nandivarmmā, who participated in Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa's coronation. This leads us to the conclusion that Pallava Nandivarmmā of the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates must have been Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, the grandfather of Nandivarman III. This is not at all unlikely. Paramēśvarman II, the predecessor of Nandivarman II, it may be remembered, ruled until at least A.D. 723, and then there ensued a period of anarchy of uncertain duration at the end of which the latter was elected king. As he ruled at least for sixty-five years, his reign must have lasted almost up to the end of 8th century A.D. There is therefore nothing improbable in his having joined Gōvinda III to crown Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa, as the king of the Gangas. The coronation of Śivamāra could not have taken place earlier than A.D. 795. He was taken prisoner by Dhruva in A.D. 786 and was kept in confinement ever since. His father Śrīpuruṣa died sometime after A.D. 788, and his ancestral kingdom was annexed by Dhruva. Gōvinda III who succeeded his father in A.D. 794 took, according to Wani-Dindori and Rādhanpūr plates,[2] compassion on him, set him at liberty and sent him back to his country. Therefore, his coronation could have taken place only after his return to his kingdom, in A.D. 794 or in the succeeding year.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla and Gōvinda III performed the coronation of

---

[1] IA. xi. pp. 125-27.
[2] IA. xi. p. 56 f, EI. vi, pp. 229-51.

Śivamāra and placed with their own hands the royal crown on his head. Assuming that this event had taken place in the 65th or the last known year of his rule, the initial date of his reign must be placed in A.D. (795-65=)730 A.D. A possible objection to this date must not be left unnoticed here. The Cōḷa king Āditya, as pointed out by Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar, defeated Aparājita, the last Pallava monarch, and put an end to the Pallava monarchy in A.D. 888. It follows from this that there elapsed 158 years between the accession of Nandivarman II and the overthrow of Aparājita; but the total number of years for which Nandivarman II and his successors ruled comes to (Nandivarman II, 65 years+Dantivarman 51 years+ Nandivarman III 22 years+Nṛpatungavarman 26 years+ Aparājita 18 years) 182 years or 24 years more than the period indicated by our data. How are we to account for this difference? The difficulty, however, is not as insurmountable as it may appear at first sight. Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer has himself indicated the way for solving the problem. While attempting to accommodate the reign of Kampavarman in his chronological scheme, he suggested, accepting Hultzsch's interpretation of the term Nandi-Kampa occuring in a Sōḻapuram epigraph as Kampavarman, the son of Nandivarman III, that Kampavarman was a 'joint ruler with either Nṛpatunga or Aparājita or with both.'[20] It is not impossible that the reigns of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and his successors overlapped one another. The father might have crowned his grown up son, as was done by the later Cōḻa kings and to some extent by the contemporary Cālukya rulers of Bādāmi, during his own life time, and taken him into partnership in the administration of the kingdom. Instead of taking the reigns of Nandivarman II and his successors in a regular consecutive order, provision must be made for the partial coincendence of successive reigns. A correct solution of the chronology of the later Pallava kings lies perhaps in this direction.

---

[20] EI. xx. pp. 48-9.

SOME EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE AŚVACIKITSITA OF NAKULA (BEFORE A.D. 1000).

BY

P. K. GODE, M.A.

Curator,

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, POONA, 4.

In the list of works and authors mentioned and quoted in the *Yuktikalpataru*[1] of King Bhoja as recorded by Pandit Isvara Chandra Sastri, I do not find the name of *Nakula*, who is quoted from in the अश्वयुक्ति section of the *Yuktikalpataru* as follows:—

Page 183—

" अथ वर्णः[2] ।

यदाह नकुलः—

सप्तवर्णा भवन्तीह सर्वेषां वाजिनां ध्रुवम् ।

तानहं कीर्त्तयिष्यामि भेदैर्ज्ञाताननेकधा ॥ ३८ ॥

सितो रक्तस्तथा पीतः सारङ्गः पिङ्ग एव च ।

---

1. Ed. with a Foreword by Dr. N. N. Law, Calcutta, 1917—On the last page the following names of works and authors quoted in the *Yuktikalpataru* are recorded:—

बृहस्पतिनीतिः, उशनसी, गर्गः, भोजः, भविष्योत्तरम्, पराशरः, नीतिशास्त्रम्, मत्स्यपुराणम्, वात्स्यः, पराशरसंहिता, गरुडपुराणम्, विष्णुधर्मोत्तरम्, गारुडः, लौहार्णवः, लौहद्वीपः, लौहप्रदीपः, पद्मपुराणम्, वृहद्धारीतः, नागार्जुनः, गर्ग्यः, पालगाकाप्यः, शङ्कः ।

2. *Cf.* वर्णाध्याय (verses 1—30) in अश्वायुर्वेद of वाग्भट, son of विक्रम (B.O.R. Institute, MS. No. 581 of 1899—1915) *folios* 15—16.

" अभिधास्यामि वर्णानामिदानीमत्र लक्षणम् ।

श्वेतः कृष्णोऽरुणः पीतः शुद्धाश्चत्वार एव हि ॥ १ ॥

पञ्चमोऽन्यस्तु वर्णस्यान्मिश्रश्चान्योन्यसंगतौ ।

ख्याता वर्णाः षडेवैते जाता भेदादनेकधा ॥ २ ॥ etc.

नीलः कृष्णोऽथ सर्वेषां श्वेतः श्रेष्ठतमो मतः ॥ ३९ ॥
श्वेतः कुन्देन्दुसङ्काशो रक्तः कौसुम्भसन्निभः ।
हरिद्रासदृशः पीतः सारङ्गः कर्बुरः स्मृतः ॥ ४० ॥
पिश(ष)ङ्गः कपिलाकारो नीलो दूर्वादलप्रभः ।
कृष्णो जम्बूफलाकारः शास्त्रज्ञैः समुदाहृतः ॥ ४१ ॥

इति अश्ववर्णाः ।"

The above quotation raises the question of Bhoja's indebtedness to नकुल, whose अश्वचिकित्सित was published long ago in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (Calcutta, 1887). It will be clear from the following evidence that the अश्वयुक्ति of Bhoja's युक्तिकल्पतरु is indebted to the अश्वचिकित्सित of नकुल:—

(1) The quotation from नकुल introduced with the words "यदाह नकुलः' reproduced above is taken from Chapter 3 of नकुल–अश्वचिकित्सित (pp. 7-8 of *Bib. Indica*, Edition, 1887) where it reads as follows:—

अथ तृतीयोऽध्यायः । वर्णवर्णनम् ।
वर्णाः सप्त भवन्तीह सर्वेषां वाजिनां ध्रुवम् ।
तानहं कीर्त्तयिष्यामि भेदैर्जातानेनकधा ॥ १ ॥
सितो रक्तस्तथा पीतः सारङ्गः पिङ्ग एव च ।
नीलः कृष्णोऽथ सर्वेषां श्वेतः श्रेष्ठतमः स्मृतः ॥ २ ॥
श्वेतः प्रालेयसङ्काशो रक्तः कुङ्कुमसन्निभः ।
हरिद्रासदृशः पीतः सारङ्गः कर्बुरः स्मृतः ॥ ३ ॥
पिङ्गः कपिलकाकारो नीलो दूर्वाप्रसंनिभः ।
कृष्णो जम्बूफलाकारः शास्त्रज्ञैः समुदाहृतः ॥ ४ ॥

In spite of a few variants this passage is almost identical with the passage quoted by Bhoja with the words यदाह नकुलः"

(2) To corroborate the above identification I record below additional comparison of verses and groups of verses common to भोज and नकुल:—

Bhoja (=B) p. 181—

" सपक्षा वाजिनः पूर्व्वं संजाता व्योमचारिणः ।
गन्धर्वेभ्यो यथा कामं गच्छान्ति च समन्ततः ॥ २३ ॥

Cf. Nakula (=N) p. 2.

"सपक्षा वाजिनः सर्वे (पूर्वं) संजाता व्योमचारिणः ।
गन्धर्वेभ्यो यथा कामं गच्छन्ति च समन्ततः ॥ ५ ॥

B. 181—" उत्तमा मध्यमा नीचाः कनीयांसस्तथा परे ।
चतुर्धा वाजिनो भूमौ जायन्ते देशसंश्रयात् ॥ २५ ॥

B. 182—" ताजिताः खुरशालाश्च तुषाराश्चोत्तमा हयाः ।
गोजिकाणाश्च केकाणाः प्रौढाहाराश्च मध्यमाः । २६ ॥
ताड़जा उत्तमाशाश्च राजशूलाश्च मध्यमाः ।
गत्वराः साध्यवासाश्च (*v. l.* साध्ववासाश्च) सिन्धुदारः कनीयसः ॥
अन्यदेशोद्भवा ये च ते वै नीचाः प्रकीर्त्तिताः ।
वाजिनो जलजाः केचिद्वाह्निजातास्तथापरे ॥ २८ ॥
समीरप्रभवाश्चान्ये तुरगा मृगजाः परे ।
जलोद्भवा द्विजा ज्ञेयाः क्षत्रिया वह्निसंभवाः ॥ २९ ॥
प्रभञ्जनभवा वैश्या मृगजाः शूद्रजातयः ।
पुष्पगन्धिर्भवेद्विप्रः क्षत्रियोऽगुरुगान्धिकः ॥ ३० ॥
घृतगन्धो भवेद्वैश्यो मीनामोदी च शूद्रकः ।
विवेकी सघृणो विप्रस्तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो बली ॥ ३१ ॥
कोष्णभावो (भावे) भवेद्वैश्यः शूद्रो निःसत्वको भवेत् ।
विप्राद्याः वाहनाः सर्वे प्रिया भूमिपतेः सदा ।"

Cf. N, 4—" उत्तमा मध्यमा नीचा कनीयांसस्तथापरे ।
चतुर्धा वाजिनो भूमौ जायन्ते देशसंश्रयात् ॥ १ ॥
ताजिकाः खुरशाणाश्च उत्तराश्चोत्तमा हयाः ।
गोजिकाणाश्च केकाणा प्रौढाहाराश्च मध्यमाः ॥ २ ॥
भाण्डजाश्चोत्तमांसाश्च राजशूलाश्च मध्ययाः ।
गोह्वराः शावराश्चैव सिन्धुपाराः कनीयसः ॥ ३ ॥
अन्यदेशोद्भवा ये च नीचनीचाश्च ते स्मृताः ।
वाजिनो जलजाः केचिद्वह्निजातास्तथापरे ॥ ४ ॥
समीरप्रभवाश्चान्ये उलूकमृगजास्तथा ।
जलोद्भवा द्विजातीयाः (*v. l.* द्विजा ज्ञेयाः) क्षत्रिया वह्निसंभवाः ॥
समीरप्रभवा वैश्या एणोलूकाश्च शूद्रजाः ।
विवेकी सघृणो विप्रस्तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो बली ॥ ६ ॥

दुष्टभावस्तथा वैश्यः शूद्रो निःसत्वकातरः (कारकः ।)
ब्राह्मणः सामवाही च भेदवाही च क्षत्रियः ॥ ७ ॥
उपादानेन वैश्यः स्याच्छूद्रो दण्डेन ताडितः ।
पुष्पगन्धः सदा विप्रः क्षत्रियोऽगुरुगन्धकः ॥ ८ ॥
घृतगन्धः सदा वैश्यो मीनामोदी च शूद्रकः ।
विप्रार्हा वाजिनः सर्वे क्षत्रियो भूपतेः सदा ॥ ९ ॥

B, *186*—" नासिकाग्रे ललाटाग्रे शङ्खे कण्ठे च मस्तके ।
आवर्त्तौ जायते येषां ते धन्यास्तुरगोत्तमाः ॥ ६२ ॥
ललाटे यस्य चावर्त्तौ द्वितीयस्तु ककुन्दरे ।
मस्तके च तृतीयस्तु स विज्ञेयो हयोत्तमः ॥ ६३ ॥

Cf. N, 10—" नासिकाग्रे ललाटाग्रे शङ्खे कण्ठे च मस्तके ।
आवर्त्तौ जायते येषां ते धन्यास्तुरगोत्तमाः ॥ ४ ॥

....

ललाटे यस्य चावर्त्तौ द्वितीयस्य स लिङ्गकः ।
मस्तके च तृतीयश्च पूर्णकुक्षिः स उत्तमः ॥ ६ ॥

B, 186—" द(ग)ण्डावर्त्तौ भवेद्यस्य वाजिनो दक्षिणाश्रयः ।
स करोति महासौख्यं स्वामिनः शिरसंज्ञितः (सञ्ज्ञितः) ॥ ६४ ॥

Cf. N, 11—" गण्डावर्त्तौ भवेद्यस्य वाजिनो दाक्षिणाश्रयः ।
(*v. l.* कपोलाभ्यन्तरावर्त्तौ विद्येते)
स करोति महासौख्यं स्वामिनः शिवसंज्ञिकः ॥ १५ ॥

B, 186—" कर्णमूले यदावर्त्तः स्तनमध्ये तथापरः ।
विजयाख्यावुभौ तौ तु युद्धकाले जयप्रदौ ॥ ६५ ॥

Cf N, 12—" कर्णमूले यदावर्त्तस्तन्मध्ये च तथापरः ।
विजयाख्यावुभौ ज्ञेयौ युद्धकाले जयप्रदौ ॥ १७ ॥

B, 186—" नासामध्ये यदावर्त्त एको वा यदि वा त्रयः ॥ ६६ ॥
चक्रवर्त्ती स विज्ञेयो वाजी भूपालभूषितः ।
कण्ठे यस्य महावर्त्तः प्रोक्तश्चिन्तामणिः शुभः ॥ ६७ ॥

Cf. N, 12—" नासामध्ये यदावर्त एको वा यदि वा त्रयः ।
चक्रवर्त्ती स विज्ञेयो वाजी भूपालपूजितः ॥ १८ ॥
कण्ठे यस्य महावर्त्त एकोऽश्वस्य (एकः स्पष्टः) प्रजायते ।
चिन्तामणिः स विज्ञेयश्चिन्तितार्थविवृद्धिदः ॥ १७ ॥

B, 186—" स्कन्धपार्श्वे यदावर्त्तः स भवेत्सुखकारकः ।"

Cf. N, 12—" स्कन्धे पार्श्वे यदावर्त्तः स भवेत् पद्मलक्षणः ।
करोति विधिवत्पद्मे स्वामिनः सततं सुखम् ॥ २० ॥

B, 184—" चतुर्भिर्वत्सरैर्दन्ताश्चत्वारः परिकीर्त्तिताः ।
पञ्चभिश्च षड्भिरेवं जायन्ते त्वथ कालिकाः ॥ ४४ ॥
षष्ठे संवत्सरे प्राप्ते कालिकान्या भवेत् तु हि ।
तथान्या सप्तमे वर्षे चतुर्थी (*vl.* चतुर्थे) कालिका भवेत् ॥ ४५ ॥
अष्टमे वत्सरे प्राप्ते जायन्ते सर्वकालिकाः ।
नवमे त्वथ ताः सर्वा आपीताः सम्भवन्ति च ॥ ४६ ॥
केचिदेकादशे वर्षे तावत्पीतत्वमागताः ।
ततः श्वेता प्रजायन्ते चतुर्दशसमावधि ॥ ४७ ॥
ततः काचप्रभा सम्यग् यावत्संवत्सरास्त्रयः ।
ततः सप्तदशादूर्ध्वं यावद्वर्षाणि विंशतिः ॥ ४८ ॥
माक्षिकाभां वदन्त्येषां (*v. l.* मक्षिभाभावदन्तेषां) यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ।"

Cf. N, 14—" चतुर्भिर्वत्सरैर्दन्ताः कालिकान्ये भवन्ति च ।
तथान्यः सप्तमे वर्षे चतुर्थः कालिको भवेत् ॥ ४ ॥
अष्टमे वत्सरे प्राप्ते प्राप्ताः स्युः सार्वकालिकाः ।
नवमे त्वथवा रेखा पीतत्वं शंसयन्ति च ॥ ५ ॥
तथाप्येकादशे वर्षे तावत्पीतत्वमागताः ।
तिष्ठन्ति दशनास्तेषां वाजिनामप्यसंशयम् ॥ ६ ॥
ततः श्वेताः प्रदृश्यन्ते यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ।
ततः काचप्रभा सम्यक् यावत्संवत्सरास्त्रयः ॥ ७ ॥
ततः सप्तदशादूर्ध्वं यावद्वर्षाणि विंशतिः ।
मक्षिकाभा रदास्तेषां यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ॥ ८ ॥

B, 184—" कालिका हरिणी शुक्ला काचा मक्षिकया सह ।
शङ्खो मूषलकश्चैव दन्तानां चलतां (ता) तथा ॥"

Cf. N, 15—" कालिका हारिणी शुक्ला काचा वाप्यथ मक्षिकाः ॥ १ ॥
शङ्खो दूखलकश्चैव दन्तानां चलनं तथा ।"

B, 184—" यस्य दत्ता यवा भोज्ये शिशिरे समुपस्थिते ।
अकृत्वापि क्रियाः सर्वाः स हयः सुखमृच्छति ॥ ३७ ॥

18

Cf. N 40—" यस्य दत्ता यवा भोज्ये शिशिरे समुपस्थिते ।
अकृतापि (*v. l.* क्रिया अपि) कृता सर्वा पञ्चर्तुजनिता हये ॥ १७

B 190—" चलकिशलयपादः कर्णमध्यैकदृष्टि-
र्न चलति कटिदेशः स्वासने संस्थितो यः ।
हयहृदयगतिज्ञः स्थानदण्डवतापः (॰दण्डावपाती)
स खलु तुरगयाता पूज्यते पार्थिवेन्द्रैः ॥ २ ॥
मेरुः स्थिरो यस्य चलौ च पादौ
त्रिकोन्नतं संहतमासनञ्च ।
स वाजिवाहः प्रथितः पृथिव्यां
शेषा नरा भारकरा हयानाम् ॥ ३ ॥

Cf. N, 21—" चलकिसलयपादः कर्णमध्यैकदृष्टिः
न चलति कटिदेशे आसने संस्थितश्च ।
हयहृदयगतिज्ञः स्थानदण्डावपाती
स खलु तुरगयोक्ता मान्यते पार्थिवेन्द्रैः ॥

B, 185—" दीर्घाः शुष्का विशालास्या ये भवन्ति तुरङ्गमाः ।
ते शस्ताः पार्थिवेन्द्रस्य यानवाहनकर्मणि ॥ ५२ ॥

Cf. N, 16—" दीर्घसूक्ष्मावभासास्या ये भवन्ति तुरङ्गमाः ।
ते शस्ताः पार्थिवेन्द्रस्य यानवाहनकर्मणि ॥ १ ॥

The foregoing comparison of extracts from the अश्वयुक्ति section of Bhoja's युक्तिकल्पतरु and from the अश्वचिकित्सित of Nakula clearly shows how Bhoja, who definitely mentions नकुल by name and quotes from his अश्वचिकित्सित has borrowed freely from Nakula's work. If the अश्वयुक्ति section in the युक्तिकल्पतरु is a genuine work of king Bhoja we have to conclude that the अश्वचिकित्सित of नकुल is earlier than Bhoja (*C.A.D.* 1050.) We are thus in a position to determine *the later limit for Nakula's work viz. C.A.D.* 1000.

As regards the earlier limit to Nakula's अश्वचिकित्सित I have to make the following observations :—

(1) The passage mentioning the *Arabian* (ताजिक) and *Khurasan* (खुरशाण) horses as the best horses is common to both Bhoja and Nakula as we have seen above. The expression "ताजिताः खरशालाः" in Bhoja's अश्वयुक्ति is a misreadinng for "ताजिकाः खुरशाणाः' used by Nakula.

(2) *Khurasan*[1] is a Province of North East Persia, bounded on the North by the U.S.S.R., on the West by Mazandaran and Iraq Ajemi, on the South by Kuhistan, and on the East by Afghanistan. It consists partly of desert and partly of high-lying land portions of which are fertile. Evidently the खुरशाण horses are equivalent to पारसीक horses, mentioned by जयदत्त in his अश्ववैद्यक, by the अमरलाश, by हेमचन्द्र in his अभिधानचिन्तामणि (C.A.D. 1140), by सामेश्वर in his मानसोल्लास (*C.A.D.* 1130) and even by बाण in his हर्षचरित (C.A. 130.)[2]

(3) I have presumed that the ताजिक horses mentioned by नकुल and भोज are equivalent to Arabian horses on the assurance of some friends. The Marathi Dictionary called the *Śabdakośa* mentions ताजी = Arabi horse (Arabic—ताझी). Whether the term ताजिक is identical with ताजी cannot be said with certainty as in the *Ain-i-Akbari* (p. 156 of Gladwin's Zeans 1897) seven kinds of horses are mentioned, in which the *Arab* horse is distinquished from the *Tazee*, which is given as the name of the best horse "mostly bred in Hindustan." To make confusion worse confounded we have *Tajik* as the name of a republic of Russia formed in 1924 out of the former regions of *Bukhara* and *Turkistan* and further सोमेश्वर in his मानसोल्लास (A.D. 1130) mentions तेजी horses among the best breeds of horses. It remains to be seen whether the terms ताजिक, तेजी, *Tazee, Tajik* are identical or otherwise. I intend to examine these terms in a separate paper with a view to clarifying the above confusion

---

[1] Vide p. 615 of *World Pictorial Gazatteer* by J. A. Hammerton.

[2] I propose to write a paper on *Persian Horses in Sanskrit literature* in which I shall record detailed evidence about Persian horses mentioned in Sanskrit texts and its bearing on the history of the import of Persian and Arabian horses in large numbers referred to in the *Bombay Gazatteer* (*Thana*) 1882 as follows:—(Page 431)—(810—1260 A.D.) *Trade Centres*—"The chief trade in Animals was towards the close of the period (1290), a great import of horses from the Persian Gulf and from Arabia. No ships came to Thana without horses......This great demand for horses seems to have risen from the scare among the Hindu rulers of the Deccan caused by the Mussalman cavalry. As many as 10,000 horses a year are said to have been imported." (Yule's *Morco Polo*, II, 330.)

and hence cannot deal with them in this paper without detailed evidence.

For the present we may conclude that Nakula's *Aśvacikitsita* is earlier than *C.A.D.* 1000 as king Bhoja has borrowed from it largely in the *Aśvayukti* section of his *Yuktikalpataru*, mentioning in one place the name of *Nakula* along with the extract borrowed.

THE MEMORABLE MESSAGE OF THE HELIODORUS COLUMN AT BESNAGAR.

K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR.

The Hindu scriptures have, sometimes, condensed their lofty ethical concepts and moral precepts in the form of triads of great significance. The Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad summed up its teaching with the three words Dama, Dāna and Dayā (self-control, charity, compassion) and proclaims it with the voice of thunder—

तदेतदेवैषा दैवी वागनुवदति स्तनयित्नुः ददद इति—दाम्यत दत्त दयध्वमिति । तदेतत् त्रयं शिक्षेत् दमं दानं दयामिति ।

(Bṛah. up. 5-2-3)

The Bhagavadgītā in its last chapter lays down succintly the duty of every man in the three words Yajña, Dāna and Tapas. It explains clearly their connotation and ethical significance and sums up in these three the precepts which should regulate him in his moral relations with Divinity, his fellowmen and his own self.

यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् ।
यज्ञं दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ।

In the scriptures of other religion also, for example, in the Bible, we find St. Paul delivering his message in the three words hope, faith and charity: 'And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of them is charity'. (Corinthians, chaps. 13.)

We find another remarkable instance in the memorable inscription in the Heliodorus column. It is found written on a fine granite pillar erected at the instance of a Greek ambassador, Heliodorus, son of Dios, at Besnagar, a place 30 miles north-east by east of Bhopal, near Bhilsa, Gwalior State. It is worthwhile to refer in full to the translation of this inscription which is as follows:—This Gurudadhvaja of the God of gods, Vāsudeva, has been made at the instance of Holiodorus a Bhāgavata, son of Dios, from Takṣaśilā, who having constrained his senses, arrived in the company of Chandadasa, the king of the family of Bhagabadra, the saviour, Kāśīputra, the son

of a lady belonging to Kautsa Gotra, of increasing glory, the vassal king of the Mahārāja Antialkidas, pledges himself to the three (cardinal virtues), the observance of which leads to immortality, *viz.*, 'Dama, Tyāga, Apramāda'. The original of the last portion of the inscription is as follows:—

(1) Trīṇi amṛtapadāni-(su)-anuthitāni

(2) nayamti svaga Dama chāga apramāda.

The pillar and the inscription were discovered by Sir John Marshal who gave an account of it in J.R.A. S. (Vol. 9, 1908). The last lines were further elucidated by great Oriental scholars, Dr. Fleet, Dr. Barnett (*vide* J.R.A.S., Vol. 9, 1053, 1093) and others. The three virtues mentioned have been translated by them as self-control, charity, and diligence respectively. Their significance has been discussed to some extent by Dr. Barnett. The word 'Apramāda', he says, is found mentioned in the Dhammapada. In regard to Tyāga he says 'the whole thing is discussed at length in the Bhagavadgītā, chapter 18.' But these scholars have not found out the Hindu scripture where this triad is mentioned and explained. As I read the inscription, I felt that a śloka containing a mention of the three virtues in similar terms might be found in our Hindu epics or Upaniṣads, especially, as it is said that the pillar is erected as a dedication to Vāsudeva by one who, though a Greek (yavana) has been imbued with Hindu culture and calls himself hence a Bhāgavata. I read through the chapters of the Mahābhārata and lighted upon a verse in the Sanatsujātīya chapters in the Udyoga Parvan which is very strikingly similar to the last lines of the inscription. The verse runs thus:

दमस्त्यागोऽप्रमादश्च एतेष्वमृतमाहितम् ।

तानि सत्यमुखान्याहुर्ब्राह्मणा ये मनीषिणः ॥

(see Mahābhārata, Kumbakonam edn. Udyoga Parvan, Sanatsujatīya, Adhyaya 3, verse, 23; P. P. S. Sastri edn. ch. 42). In the succeeding verses 24 to 36, the significance of the three is fully explained and the qualities denoted by them are enumerated. A perusal of these verses will make the reader fully realise the lofty significance of the three words for the first time, Dama, Tyāga, and Apramāda and the noble inspiring ideals denoted by them and the memorable message contained in this inscription worthy of perpetuation for all time in this permanent way by the granite pillar by a foreigner who came into contact with Hindu civilization in its palmy days and was

deeply touched by the fundamental core of the teachings of Hindu scriptures and the wise sayings of India's great Seers.

The inscription says that the three form the foundation for immortality. So does Sanatsujāta also declare. Sanatsujāta further elucidates the qualities denoted by the three. It is remarkable to note that the virtues indicted by the word 'Dama' begin with Satya, truth, and end with Ahimsā, non-violence. The other sixteen between the two are Apaiśuna, Atṛṣṇā, Aprātikūlya, Atamaḥ, Arati, Lokādveṣa, Anabimāna, Avivāḍa, Aprāṇipīḍana, Aparivāda, Anativāda, Aparitāpa, Kṣamā, Dhṛti, Siddhi, Apāpakṛtya. Tyāga is said to comprise three virtues, generosity to the needy and to one's own family, charity, *i.e.*, gifts to the Gods in Yajñas and to public utility, and thirdly renunciation of desires. Apramāda is defined as composed of eight qualities, namely Satya (Truth), Dhyāna, (contemplation), Samādhāna (Inward Peace), Codya (Philosophic enquiry), Vairāgya (Desirelessness), Asteya (freedom from theiving), Brahmacarya (Sexual purity), Aprigraha (Poverty). In the begining of the chapter, Sanatsujāta has further declared that Apramāda is itself Immortality while Pramāda is Mṛtyu or death. (See ch. 42, verse 4.) Thus we see that the inscription reveals a memorable message containing the quintessence of India's loftiest teachings.

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

SECOND FOUNDATION DAY.

The second Foundation Day of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, was celebrated on Sunday, September 1st, 1946, at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore. There was a large and distinguished audience.

Dr. Sir. Rm. Alagappa Chettiar, M.A., D. Litt., L.L.D., Bar-at-law, presided; Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar delivered the Foundation Day address.

Srī A. Shanmukha Mudaliar, M.A., one of the Secretaries, read messages received from learned institutions, scholars and men of public importance:—

Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, Poona, retiring President, All India Oriental Conference, wished the function every success, and the Institute a glorious career. He also enrolled himself as a Life Member of the Institute.

Dr. S. M. Katre, Director, Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona, wished the function a great success.

Srimant Pantsaheb Pratinidhi, Rajah Saheb of Aundh, a Life Member of the Institute, wished the function every success.

Dewan Bahadur S. Aravamuda Aiyangar, Member, H.E.H. the Nizaṃ's Executive Council, Hyderabad, a Life Member of the Institute, wished all success to the function.

Sri M. S. Aney, Govt. of India Representative in Ceylon, a Life Member of the Institute, wished success.

Sri S. T. G. Varadacharya, M.A., Principal, Narasimha Sanskrit College, Chittugudur, Masulipatam, a Life Member of the Institute, said in the course of his message:

'Much as I wish to be present on the happy occasion of the foundation day of the Research Institute founded in the name of my revered Professor, I cannot do so.......May the following stanza serve as my representative then.

स किंविमर्शो दृढबद्धमूलः तलस्पृशा यो न परिश्रमेण ।
इतीदमुद्घोषयतात्सभासौ नाम्ना स्थिता देशिकदिग्गजस्य ॥

"It is false research which is not firmly based upon deep study—May this Institute which stands in the name of the prince among professors proclaim this."

Sri K. Subramanyam, Mylapore, had also sent a message.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar, one of the Secretaries, presented the Report of the Institute's work for the year 1945-1946. Grateful tribute was paid by him to the service rendered by the first President, the late Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri to the Institute.

Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E., President of the Institute, in welcoming Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar and Dr. Sir Alagappa Chettiar, referred to Dr. Chettiar's high educational attainments, wide cultural interests and munificent benefactions.

THE FOUNDATION DAY ADDRESS.

Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar then delivered the Foundation Day address. He said:

"When my friend Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar requested me to deliver the Address on the occasion of the Founder's Day of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, I readily consented to do so not because I have any pretentions to any learning in Sanskrit but because of the veneration in which I held Professor Kuppuswami Sastri during his lifetime, and of myself being given the opportunity to pay my tribute to the memory of the late Professor. The name of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri is closely associated with the renaissance of Sanskrit culture in this part of India, a culture which has been the bedrock of Hindu civilisation in its different phases and the fountain source from which all the great religious teachers of India whether in the Dravida country or in the Northern India derived their inspiration.

The career of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri reminds us of a lesson gatherable from the lives of great men, that it is possible that the services of a genius in art, literature or science might be lost to a country if talent is not discovered and given encouragement in the proper time. After a period of continued study in different Sastras under eminent scholars and great Pandits in the orthodox and traditional style and after graduating in the S. P. G. College, it is interesting to note that he entered service as a clerk in the Board of Revenue on Rs. 25

which was considered to be a good start in a Government office for a graduate in those days. Even during the period he was employed as a clerk, he was devoting himself to further studies in Sanskrit literature and the Sastras and during his leisure hours he was giving religious discourses to people interested in higher Sanskrit studies in Mylapore. The ease with which he handled recondite questions in Advaita Philosophy attracted the attention of the late Mr. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar who had the unerring instinct to discover talent wherever it might be lurking and bring out what was best in it. Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyar appointed him as the first Principal of the Madras Sanskrit College. One is reminded of the choice of Professor Sir Raman and Sir S. Radhakrishnan by the late Mr. Justice Austosh Mukerji to the chair of Physics and Philosophy respectively, a choice which has not a little contributed to the great place which India is occupying in the scientific and philosophical world at the present day. In that capacity he came in contact with some of the best Pandits in Sanskrit who were appointed to fill the different chairs in the Sanskrit College, Mylapore. Professor Kuppuswami Sastri successively held with great distinction the Principalship of the Madras Sanskrit College and the Tiruvadi Sanskrit College and in the year 1920, he was called upon to fill the Professorship of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College in succession to the late Professor Rangachari, a post which was held by eminent Sanskritists from the inauguration of the Sanskrit Chair in the College. As Professor of Sanskrit he came into intimate contact with the University, was a member of the Senate, the Academic Council and the President of the Board of Studies and Examiners in the Madras University. He was also external examiner to several other Universities in India and was intimately connected with them. In the reorganisation of University studies after the passing of the new University Act, he was mainly responsible for giving a new orientation and direction for Sanskrit studies in the University of Madras. The Siromani courses on the traditional lines, the Oriental Title degrees in this University, the Sanskrit Honours syllabus were all fashioned by him. As an acknowledged authority in linguistics he was responsible for the institution of the course in Comparative Philology. He was loath to leave the subject of Oriental Research and the exploration of ancient classics by the application of Western methods of research and scholarship to western

scholars, who labour under the evident disadvantage of not being able to get into the genius and spirit of Indian culture. He was keen on the establishment of a school of Oriental Research which without in any way sacrificing the profundity and learning characteristic of our ancient Pandits, will utilise that scholarship for the promotion of research and historical criticism. He was responsible more than any other for the establishment of the Oriental Research Institute at the Madras University and the starting of a Journal of Oriental Research in Madras in which could be garnered contributions from all savants in Oriental literature.

His scholarship was not confined to any single branch of Sanskrit studies. It is not often that you find in a single professor or Pandit a combination of profound knowledge and learning in Kavya, Vyakarana, Mimamsa, Vedanta and modern scholarship. But Professor Kuppuswami Sastri's range of knowledge extended over every branch of Sanskrit studies. The question has been sometimes put as to how it is that with such profound learning he did not leave many works of note. The answer is two fold. (1) He set such a high standard for any work emanating from him and he applied such a searching criticism to his own work that the completion of the work according to his standard took an immeasurably long time. One is reminded of the great learning of Lord Acton and the incomplete works and notes which he left behind. (2) Professor Kuppuswami Sastri was to a large extent inspired by the ideals which distinguished the early teachers and Pandits of India. It is in the great tradition of India from the time of the Upanishads that the main work of a scholar and a seer is in the learning which he imparts to others and in the number of savants and Pandits whom he initiates and gives to the world. That is why I believe *Nitya-Adhyayana* and the inculcating of knowledge to others are both enjoined as a religious duty by our ancient scriptures. To impart learning to others and to train a band of scholars is the tradition of the Upanishads. That is the tradition of Greek scholars and painters. The world knows Gaga Batta through Nilakantha, the author of the Vyavahara Mayukha, Socrates and his sayings only through Plato, the great Buddha himself through the Jataka stories as narrated by his disciples and latterly Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa through Vivekananda.

Today are scattered over the length and breadth of South India eminent Pandits and Sanskrit scholars, who sat under the feet of the Professor. What probably the world of letters has lost, the Pandit world has gained.

Before I close, I should like to refer to one other trait in the Professor's scholarship. The Professor spoke and lectured in Sanskrit with a remarkable facility which made men feel that there is no point in the oft-repeated statement that Sanskrit was a dead language. The lucidity of his diction and the clarity of his pronunciation enabled even a person with a smattering knowledge of Sanskrit to follow him.

I would close these few disjointed remarks of mine with the following observations. While no institution at the present day can flourish without public support and financial assistance rendered by Government, it is as well to remind ourselves on this occasion that what makes for the success of any institution is dedication of service to its aims and ideals, a band of scholars and Pandits imbued with the spirit of research and scholarship, a determination on the part of its votaries to get rid of the shackles of idle pedantry and effete antiquarianism."

This was followed by the reading of two short Research Papers by Rao Sahib Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai and Dr. V. Raghavan on the Śilappadikāram and Dara Shikoh's *Majma-ul-Bahrain*, the texts of which are published below.

DR. SIR ALAGAPPA CHETTIAR'S ADDRESS.

Rising amidst cheers, Sir Alagappa Chettiar thanked Mr. Venkatarama Sastriar for his kind references, and regretted that it had become the fashion now-a-days to refer to the Classics as a dead language. Sanskrit literature was their great Classic, and it was the good fortune of India to possess it.

People of all ages felt that the Classics were contemporary and could never be out of date. The Classics contained those imperishable, undying and eternal values, and had given expression to truth, goodness and beauty, and their values could never change. The Classics were an unerring guide and proper corrective to the mind's attitude towards life.

Proper understanding and perspective could be achieved only by a study of the Classics, and the Classics were in abundance in this country and Institutes like the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute would give ample opportunities to many students.

Continuing, Sir Alagappa Chettiar said that there was a great duty cast upon scholars and societies to popularise the Classics without losing their fundamental values.

In attempting to popularise the Classics and make them appeal to the masses they must not lose the sense of the very great values which were embedded in the Classics.

Everyone of them should consider it his sacred duty to understand the Classics. Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar represented a combination of the scholarly dignity of a Pandit and also of modern culture. South India must be proud that it had such a great figure after whom this Institute was founded.

Sir Alagappa Chettiar said that they were grateful to foreign scholars, like Professor Max Muller, who had made a deep study of their Classics and had contributed much to Hindu thought and ideas.

He understood that, at the Peace Conference, attempts were made to get old manuscripts in Yugoslavia and Germany, and he hoped that attempts would be made to secure the other ancient manuscripts as well.

As Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar combined in himself the deep and penetrating study of a great scholar of the past and a comparatively wide study of modern knowledge, he was in a position to make a rational approach to the great Classics, and if they were to profit in their researches into the Classics, that rational approach had to be maintained. Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar had given them a blue-print for research into the Classics, and they must take advantage of that blue-print. He wished them all success. He hoped that the Institute would give opportunities for scholars, not only in this part of the country, but from other parts of India as well.

Sir Alagappa Chettiar regretted that even in these days, they were not able to find enough money for researches. He hoped that contributions would flow in, and the Institute would grow from strength to strength.

Mr. K. Balasubrahmania Ayyar proposed a vote of thanks.

SILAPPADIKARAM

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.
(Reader in Tamil, University of Madras)

The Śilappadikāram is one of our great classics and deals with the well-known story of Kōvalan and Kaṇṇaki. Traditionally, it is held to be one of the Pañcakāvyas, the other four being the Cintāmaṇi, the Maṇimēkhalai, the Vaḷaiyāpati and the Kuṇḍalakēśi. Of these, the Maṇimēkhalai is closely connected with the Śilappadikāram and is, in fact, a sequel to the latter kāvya, the heroine being the daughter of Kōvalan by his mistress, Mādhavi. Hence these two kāvyas have been styled by some modern writers as the twin-epics, the epic of the anklet and the epic of the jewelled girdle. No doubt, 'epic' is a misnomer in this connection. Iḷaṅgovaḍigaḷ and Kūlavāṇikan Śāttanār, their respective authors are necessarily contemporaries, since they are credited to have set their seal of approval on each other's kāvya, as soon as composed.

The Śilappadikāram was published in its entirety in 1892 by the late Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer. But even before this, the kāvya had gained some publicity. The hon'ble Mr. P. Kumaraswami of Ceylon had pointed out that Gajabāhu mentioned in the kāvya must be identical with Gajabāhu I of the Ceylonese chronicle, Mahāvaṃśa. This king, according to Geiger, the editor of the chronicle, ruled for twenty-two years from 171 A.D. Following the wake of Mr. Kumaraswami, Mr. V. Kanagasabai Pillai, the famous author of 'The Tamils 1800 years ago', fixed the date of Śenkuṭṭuvan, the king of the Sangam period and contemporary of Gajabāhu. This contemporaneity was considered to be vouched for by a statement in text that its author was the younger brother of Śenkuṭṭuvan. The Śilappadikāram and the Maṇimēkhalai were thus assigned to the latter half of the 2nd century A.D. The authors were believed to have dealt with contemporaneous events in their works. Thus, a definite foothold for the date of the third Tamil Sangam was considered to have been secured. This was held to be the sheet-anchor upon which the chronological system of the ancient Tamil literature solely depended. Hence scholars and historians were eagerly looking forward to an authoritative edition of the text and commentaries of this classic. And

Dr. Swaminatha Iyer, the ablest editor of the day, supplied this desideratum.

The historical interest of the kāvya over-shadowed, for a time, its literary excellences. The fascinating beauty of the story, the charm of narration, the powerful dramatic situations tense with emotion, the lyrical quality of the songs, the limpid style, the melody of the verses, the felicity of diction—all these contributing to the magnificence of the poem, had to wait for recognition till the more imperious needs of the antiquarian were fully satisfied. Even the ordinary man in the street shared his enthusiasm. It was thought that the antiquity of the Tamils and of their literature depended entirely upon the date assigned to this kāvya. And the protagonists of the 2nd cent. theory maintained their position with a tenacity rarely equalled. Any scholar who had the audacity to doubt this was held to be a bitter enemy of the Tamils and traitor in the camp. So it was not a simple historical problem at all that the critical scholar had to face. He had to deal with a complicated mental state which would easily lead to communal hatred. Naturally there were acrimonious controversies. And instances were not wanting where these were sought to be set at rest by unanimous resolutions of learned societies, fixing the date of the kāvya and condemning those who dared to dissent. A short way, indeed, of settling historical and literary problems! No need for elaborate studies, no need for investigation and research and no need for weighing evidence!

Dr. Hultzsch and Rao Bahadur Venkayya, whose reputation in the field of archaeology and South Indian history was of the highest, were the first to regard this date of Śilappadikāram with some degree of scepticism. Mr. K. V. Subramania Iyer, in his 'Historical sketches of Ancient Dekhan', brought forward some arguments in support of this sceptical position. Recently, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri tackled this problem and has come to the conclusion that it must be a late work. I have also dealt with this problem in some of my contributions and arrived at the same result. I do not intend to follow this controversy in this short paper; but I do want that the main position must be understood clearly. The crucial point is whether Iḷaṅgōvaḍigaḷ was narrating contemporaneous events in his great poem. If this is not proved, then the date of the poem may be far later. I shall content myself here with saying that there are very strong grounds to believe

that the events were not contemporaneous with the author. Naccinārkiniyar says definitely that the kāvya embodies a story of olden times. It would interest you to know that the late Prof. Kuppusawami Sastri, in whose honour and memory this Research Institute had been founded, helped the solution of the problem by proving a late date for the Maṇimēkhalai. His main reason was that the 29th canto of this work was a literal translation of a section in Nyāyapravēśa of Diṅnāga, the Buddhist logician of the 5th century A.D. Necessarily therefore, the so-called twin-epics must have been composed later than this date. Other evidences point to the conclusion that the 8th cent. A.D. is the most probable date of the kāvya. This is not to deny the synchronism of Senkuṭṭuvan and Gajabāhu and it must be clearly borne in mind that the date of the 3rd Sangam is not in the least affected by the above conclusion. The Sangam age might very well be the 2nd century A.D. In fact, any sober and unbiased enquiry can only lead to this result. Most probably, Illaṅgōvaḍigaḷ gave currency in his work to a genuine tradition about the synchronism, referred to above.

The chronology is helpful in making the milieu of the poem better understood. Let us turn to the poem itself and study its historical background. The ancient Tamils, in whatever field they might have achieved distinction, were not born story-tellers. They were of a hardy race and their character made for a union of strength, tenderness and fidelity. They concerned themselves mainly with the practical and immediate affairs of life. The Sangam literature bear ample testimony to this fact and the realistic spirit that pervades it precludes any possibility of a romantic tale. The earliest tale, of which there is any evidence, is the story of the Mahābhārata. The establishment of a Tamil Sangam at Madura and the translation of the Mahābhārata into Tamil were the two achievements ascribed to an ancient king, in an early inscription. Thus, it was from the Āryans of the North that the art of story-telling found its way into the Tamilagam. The Tamil poet of that age had no elaborate traditional art, no repertory of ancestral tales as familiar to his hearers as to himself and no audience composed of the best in the land. Centuries passed. And with the passage of time, the Āryan contact became closer and more intimate. Their religion with its elaborate ceremonials caught the fancy of the people. The Tamil kings performed Rājasūya

and other vedic sacrifices and one king was called Pal-yāgasālai-mudukuḍumi-peruvaḷudi, the great Pandya king of many sacrificial halls. Adherents of heretical religions also, the Buddhists and the Jains, imigrated in great numbers and mass conversion began. Emphasis on ethics was the dominant note of these religions and several didactic poems, known as Kīḻkaṇakku works were, in consequence, produced. It may be easily seen that ethics is hardly the soil in which romance and story-telling can flourish. Ceremonial religion soon asserted itself and led to a religious revivalism. Hymnal literature was the natural and direct result. Again, ceremonialism brought in its train the cultivation of several arts including dancing. Controversies also raged amongst the vedic religionists, the Jains and the Buddhists; and the result was an assiduous cultivation of the science of logic. Puranic lore increased by leaps and bounds. The Tamilian society imbibed more and more the Aryan culture and civilization. Cities and temples grew in numbers. The Northern India became more familiar and the great Sanskrit literature began to exercise its potent spell on the unsophisticated Tamil mind. In this milieu tales began to appear. But Sanskrit originals were taken and rendered into Tamil verse. Udayanan-peruṅgadai, evidently based on the Sanskrit version by Durvinīta of Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā may be cited as an instance. This tale, of which a major portion has been recovered and edited by the late Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer, may be reasonably assigned to circa 700 A.D.

The most notable feature of this romantic tale is its metre. A kind of continuous verse known as 'ahaval'—and not stanza —is employed in this work. This metre has a noble tradition from the very beginning of Tamil literature and is indigenous to the Tamil language. The nearest equivalent of this verse is the Blank verse in English. No metre corresponding to this exists in the Sanskrit language. Perfected through centuries by the great masters of language, enriched with the phrases and formulas of generations of older poets, and endowed with a loveliness that ravishes our heart, it is a splendid medium of poetic speech. The witchery o the author's art, his stylistic perfection and the sensuous beauty of his diction secure for him a place next only to Iḷaṅgōvaḍigal and Kamban. But he composed a romance and however much it may appeal to our sense of wonder and of beauty, its appeal to our heart is limited.

The sense of unreality damps our soul and we are left only with a chill admiration for the poet.

Following this Jain poet, a Buddhist author, Śāttanār, wrote the Maṇimēkhalai, a religious romance. There is, in this work, too much of religion and too much of dogma to render of it of any value as a romantic tale. The style and diction are far from attractive, but the metre employed is again ahaval. Generally speaking, it is an inferior poem in every respect. But its chief interest lies in the fact that it is a work contemporaneous with the Śilappadikāram.

The latter kāvya composed shortly after Maṇimēkhalai deals, as already said, with a well-known story. Kōvalan and Kaṇṇaki, its hero and heroine, belong to two rich Vaiśya families of Kāviripūmpaṭṭinam. After a short wedded life with Kaṇṇaki, Kōvalan deserts her, falls in love with Mādhavi, a courtesan and loses all his wealth in the pursuit of pleasure. A few years later, he suspects the fidelity of his mistress and returns to his faithful wife in a repentant mood. Both leave their home for Madura, with the hope of retrieving their fortune in this ancient city. But fate decrees otherwise. While trying to sell one of the anklets of his wife, he is caught by the machinations of a wicked goldsmith, brought before the king and charged with the theft of the queen's anklet. The king, in a moment of forgetfulness, orders him to be put to death. Kaṇṇaki hearing of this, enters the palace and proves the innocence of her beloved Kōvalan. The king dies in grief. His queen also swoons and gives up her life. Kaṇṇaki, consumed with grief for her husband and seething with rage for the injustice, wrenches one of her breasts and throws it at the city of Madura. The city perishes in flames. Madurāpati, the guardian diety of Madura, appears before her and holds out a promise that she would meet her Kōvalan in his ethereal body on the fourteenth day. Driven by this hope, she rushes westward along the southern bank of the Vaigai and reaches Tiruc-cen-kōḍu. There, on the day of promise, Kōvalan descends in a celestial car and Kaṇṇaki, leaving this wicked world, joins her husband in the world of the immortals. Such, in brief, is the outline of the story in the first two Kāṇḍas. The third and last Kāṇḍa deals with the apotheosis of Kaṇṇaki and the consecration of an idol in her honour, by Śeṅkuṭṭuvan.

The story is indigenous to the soil. Even before the time of Iḷaṅgōvaḍigal, it must have reached its full growth.

For the Śilappadikāram is instanced as one of the class of works known as *Tonmai.* Echoes of the story are heard even in the Sangam age. The colophons to some of the Puranānūru poems speak of a Kaṇṇaki who was deserted by her lord Pēhan in favour of a mistress. Again we hear in Narrinai of a Tirumāvuṇṇi who, out of her unbearable grief for her estranged lover, wrenched out one of her breasts. We also learn of a poem, called Pattinippāṭṭu, in which a wife, finding her husband murdered, his arms torn off and his body in a pool of red blood, laments wildly. Probably out of these elements, the story grew and developed. Even after the time of Iḷangōvaḍigal, popular imagination played round the story and created several versions of it, differing from the original and from one another in great many details.

It may be noted that the story treats of a social evil, the institution of hetaerae. In sharp antithesis both to the fantastic romance and to the epic of national tradition, is this tale of a comparatively advanced society. Our sympathies are evoked and we feel we can enter into the varying moods of the several characters. The tragic situations are convincing realities. 'The poignancy of the tragedy is not somehow warded off; the tragic cry is not dissolved in a saintly ardour of suffering; the calamity does rightly come home'. The dramatic situations are never missed. The scene where Kaṇṇaki approaches the king's court and challenges his wisdom and justice grips our heart and we are overwhelmed with its tragic intensity. The poetic treatment of the story and the narrative manner need special mention. The style and diction compare very favourably with those of Udayanan-kathai. Judged by every standard, the Śilappadikāram is a noble work of art and the praise of our national poet, Bharati, is not at all misplaced.

The author may be charged with pedantry in his treatment of dance and music; but we are ever grateful to him for the details he has given of these sister-arts. We are now trying to revive them. Is it not our duty to understand the ideals of our fore-fathers in regard to these ancient arts?

A good modern edition of this noble kāvya and a good English translation of it are sad necessities. I hope scholars will address themselves to this task in the immediate future.

DARA SHIKOH'S MAJMA-UL-BAHRAIN

(*Samudra-Saṁgama-Grantha*)

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

In his Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit published by us on last year's Foundation Day, the late Professor in whose honoured name this Research Institute is founded, has emphasised the idea that Synthesis and Harmony formed not only the Highway of Sanskrit Literary criticism, but the very key to the understanding of Hinduism and Hindu culture. In his "Compromises in the History of Advaitic Thought" which we are publishing today, the Professor again says: " . . . . . in this way, by encouraging an ever-increasing stress on *Samvāda, Sampratipatti, Parasparabhāvanā,* mutual adjustments, mutual regard, and mutual concession, in the sphere of thinking, speaking and doing (manas, vāk, kāya); —thus, perhaps it is, that, all through the ages, the cultural life of India has been growing, with its distinctive features of absorption, tolerance, synthesis and accommodation." It is well-known to students of the history of Indian culture how the Ganges of of Hinduism had absorbed the waters of numerous tributaries and had grown into a mighty river; but it is not so well known that in its great efforts at synthesis and harmonising, it did not refrain from boldly comprehending the faith of the Prophet whose followers had come to this land, grown in numbers and made themselves part of this country. Few indeed will be the students of Indian History and culture in whom the present political ills of the country and more so the recent tragedy enacted in Calcutta would not have created again that wistful reflection 'How different would have been the course of Indian history had Dara Shikoh succeeded Shah Jehan to the Mogul gadi in Delhi and not Aurangazeb, had the new religious synthetic spirit inaugurated by Akbar the Great, the spirit which bloomed forth into greater efflorescence in his great-grandson Prince Dara Shikoh, had been allowed to reach its happy consummation of an Indo-Islamic unity, a consummation which is the ardent prayer and hope of every one of us meeting at the end of the holy Id.'

Prince Dara Shikoh was the eldest and beloved son of Shah Jehan; his more politically ambitious younger brother persecuted him, and to serve his ends, made the religious heads proclaim Dara an apostate to the faith of the Prophet and had him executed. After executing Dara, Aurangazeb accosted Sarmad, one of Dara's great Gurus, and asked him about his prophecy that Dara would succeed to Shah Jehan's throne; Sarmad, who knew his royal pupil so well, said "My prophecy has not proved false; God has given him eternal sovereignty." One of his masters, Mulla Shah, said that while Timur and Shah Jehan were kings of grandeur, Dara was king of the heart. Indeed, Dara prized not the throne of Delhi; born by the grace of the saint Mu'inuddin Chishti, and brought up amidst Hindu and Muslim mystics, Dara developed greater interest in spiritual realisation rather than in material aggrandisements. In his work Safinat-ul-Awliya which he wrote in his 28th year on his Sufi preceptor Miyan Mir, Dara, referring to his own revelation, says: "God has given thee that which no Emperor of the world has ever possessed." It is for this kingdom of the King of kings that Dara aspired and strove for.

Dara was initiated into the Qadiriya order of Sufis by Miyan Mir. He came into close contact with the greatest Sufi divines of his time and drank deep at the fountain of this exalted mysticism of the Sufis which arose within the fold of the Prophet's faith, much like the Vedānta within the fold of Vedic religion, and pioneers of which like Hosain Mansoor proclaimed, even as the Ṛshis of the Upanishads, the truth of *Anal Haq*, I am God, *Tat Tvam Asi*.

"Dara himself says in his short third work, the Risāla-i-Hak Numā, that God had vouchsafed to him *Tawhid* (तौहीद्) or *Divine Unity* and that at this stage of perfection there would remain no doubt that *Thou Art the Truth*. Rejecting the mere dogma of the orthodox priests, he, as a mystic, established himself in the path of personal spiritual experience, Anubhava. He was indeed a great scholar in his own religion, as well as in those of others, and shed much new light on many a passage in the holy Kuran, and as a contrast to his own great-grandfather, the sponsor of the eclectic *Din-i-Ilahi*, he personally wrote several spiritual treatises for the greater clarification of the understanding of himself and those near him; his work in comparative religion was far

more substantial; but all the time, as the dominating character of his writings show, his was not the spirit of a dry scholastic writer, but that of a genuine mystic; his books are not an exhibition of polemical minutae, but a treasure of spiritual gems, bearing the glow of Anubhava. In fact, Mullah Shah asked Dara to go forth as a teacher and impart spiritual instructions.

Two other works which Dara wrote as a Sufi, are (1) his first work written in his 25th year, the Safinat-ul-Awliya, in which he described the lives and greatness of about 411 saints and divines; and (2) a collection of Sufi aphorisms called Hasanāt-ul-Ārifin, in which he justifies the ecstatic utterances of himself and other Sufis, against the criticisms of the orthodox.

Like all mystics who revelled in the realisation of the one Truth, whatever its various denominations, Dara too fraternised with the mystics of other faiths. Bernier, the Christian traveller, refers in his Travels to Dara being a Christian with a Christian, and a Pandit and Sānnyāsin with the Brahmans of Benares. Dara sat in the Court Hall with his father when the great recluse Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī of Benares, waited upon Shah Jehan for getting repealed the Pilgrim tax, *Jessia*, levied at the holy bathing places like Benares and Prayag by the Mogul kings, and in that connection expounded for several days the truths of Hinduism. Kavīndrācārya and Dara moved closely as we find from some Hindi songs of Kavīndra on Dara in manuscript in the Bikaner Library. There is a long Sanskrit letter which Dara Shikoh had addressed to a Hindu Sannyāsin, Goswami Nṛsiṁhāśrama Sarasvatī in which Dara pays his obisance to the same with the Nārāyaṇa-Aṣṭākṣara mantra:—

श्रीगोस्वामिनृसिंहाश्रमेषु प्रकटितपरामनन्दसन्दोहतत्त्वज्ञानदूरीकृतमहामोहसमवगतसप्तभूमिकासमारोहमहम्मददाराशिकोहकृता। ओंनमोनारायणायेति अष्टाक्षरमन्त्रपूर्वका नमस्काराः सन्ति ।

The Hindu mystic whom Dara sought most and whom he mentions more than once is Baba Lal Bairagi, whom he met at Lahore and whose spiritual conversations with the Prince are recorded in a book, compiled by his Secretary Chandar Bhau, called *Mukālima-i-Dārā Shikūh wa Bābā Lāl*. Dara's inclusion of Bābā Lāl in his work on the lives of the Muslim Saints shows the high esteem in which the Prince held this Hindu mystic.

From the company and the teachings of all these Hindu mystics, Dara became more and more initiated into the tenets of Hinduism, and began appreciating the essential unity of the two faiths. In his *Risāla-i-Hak Numa,* Dara expatiates upon the yogic practices of breath-control, Prāṇāyāma. It is an index of the height of Dara's spiritual ascent that, like advanced Advaitic saints, the Prince was greatly attracted to the Yogavāsiṣṭha which he also quotes in one of his treatises. There was already a Persian translation of this Sanskrit philosophical classic done at the instance of Akbar; but Dara did not find it good enough. He ordered a fresh and simple rendering, in whose preface he says that the work was undertaken by him at the instance of sage Vasiṣṭha and Prince Rāmacandra who appeared to him in a dream. Another work of Dara in this same direction is his Persian translation of the Bhagavad Gītā. Two years before his execution, he translated into Persian 50 Upaniṣads under the title *Sirr-i-Akbar* meaning *the Great Secret,* which formed the basis of a French and Latin translation of the Upaniṣads by a French traveller in 1801-2. Dara's preface to this Upaniṣad-translation is very important, for here he truly exalts the Hindu Upaniṣads: Now thus sayeth this griefless fakir, Muhammad Dara Shikoh . . . . As he had an ardent desire for seeing the God-knowing devotees of the various orders, and hear their high utterances regarding monotheism, he had read the various works on mysticism and had himself composed tracts, but in spite of this, his thirst for understanding *Tawhid* (Divine Identity), which is a vast ocean, was increasing more and more. . . . . There were many secrets concealed in the Holy Kuran and the Sacred Book whose interpreter it was difficult to find. So he, the author, desired to read all the revealed Books, for the utterances of God elucidate and explain one another. It may be that in one place it is found in compendium, while in others it may be given in detail, . . . He read the Old Testament and the New Testament and the Psalms of David and other scriptures but the discourse on Tawhid found in them was brief. . . . He then examined the religious works of the Hindus and found that the Upaniṣads were an ocean of monotheism. Hence he undertook to translate them with the help of Pandits and Sannyāsins of Benares. He adds that many a knotty point was solved by a reference to the Upaniṣads and viewed in this light it is the Upaniṣads, Dara says, that a verse of the Kuran refers to, as the Hidden

Book mentioned therein cannot be the Pslams, the Pentateuch or the Gospels.

With all his appreciation of Hinduism, Dara did not cease to be a follower of the path of the Prophet, a circumstance which adds to the value of his endeavours to harmonise the two religions. The result of his comparative study of these two religions, he embodied in a separate treatise called *Majma-ul-Bahrain*, meaning the Mingling of the Two Oceans, the two oceans of Hinduism and Islam. What is more interesting is that of this Persian work of his, he prepared a Sanskrit version called *Samudra-Saṁgama-Grantha*, the work on the mingling of the two oceans. Of this Sanskrit version of Dara's Majma-ul-Bahrain, there are only two manuscripts known so far, one in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, and another in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner; and I am engaged in studying the Sanskrit work and editing it critically on the basis of these two manuscripts which I have secured.*

Without going into the details of the contents of this important work, I shall give a bird's-eye view of its substance, as my attempt this evening has been to draw the attention of the general enlightened public to the importance of the great endevour of Dara Shikoh and its value for the culture and life of this country. As in his other works, here too Dara refers to himself as a man of realisation; he describes himself as one free from desire and dejection:

अथ कथयति वीतरागविगतशोकसंदोहो दाराशिकोहः ।

He says in the opening that in his desire to know in full the conclusions of the Vaidikas, he sought many Hindu mystics and chiefly through his guru Baba Lal, he attained siddhi in Tapas and Jñāna.

तदनु चैतद् विचारमध्ये प्रविष्टम् मया यदन्तं प्राप्नुयामाभिप्रायस्य सिद्धानां निश्चेतृणां वैदिकानामनादिकुलजानामिति । अथ च कैश्चित्कैश्चिद् वैदिकैः सह, विशेषतः चैतन्यस्वरूपज्ञानमूर्तिसद्गुरुबाबालाल अन्तं तपस्याया ज्ञानस्य सौबुद्धयस्य ईश्वरप्राप्तेः शान्तेश्च प्राप्तवान् ।

---

* On seeing a Press report of this paper, Dr. Harshe of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona, informed me of a third Ms. of the work in his own possession and has generously offered to place it at my disposal for my edition.

By his frequent contacts with Baba Lal he realised that the differences between Islam and Hinduism were verbal, not essential.

तेन च सह पुनःपुनः संगतीः गोष्ठीश्चाकरवं परिभाषाभेदातिरिक्तं कमपि भेदं स्वरूपावाप्तौ नापश्यम् ।

He then proceeded to harmonise the two faiths, and as in this work the oceans of two such faiths enshrining wisdom are brought together, he called the work the Union of the Two Oceans—

अतश्च द्वयोरपि एकवाक्यतामकरवम्.....ज्ञानिनोर्द्वयोरपि मत-समुद्रयोः इह संगम इति नाम चास्थापयं समुद्रसंगम इति ।

The great ones are of the opinion that the fruit of all philosophies must be enquiry into truth without any prejudice or intolerance; the great ones alone know how difficult it is to reach the heart of a faith, and they, possessed of knowledge, alone derive bliss from such findings and not those of stunted minds who see only differences. These findings of my own experience, I have set forth, Dara says, for the benefit of those belonging to me, and not for the ignorant folk of these two faiths who see differences:

इत्थं किलोपदेशो महानुभावानां यन्निर्मत्सरतया तत्त्वविवेचनं सकल-वेदान्तानां प्रयोजनम्, अतो यः कश्चिद्विवेकज्ञानी च स एव जानाति तथ्यनिर्णयतलस्पर्शे कीदृशः श्रम इति । निश्चयेन विद्वांसो ज्ञानिनश्च बहुतरं सुखमितः प्राप्स्यान्ति, न प्राप्स्यन्ति च भेदवादिनः कुण्ठितमतय इति स्वानुभवानुसारेण च निर्णीय तत्त्वार्थं स्वकुटुम्बेष्वनुकंपया कृतोऽयमारंभः, न पुनरज्ञानिनोः विभिन्नमतसंबान्धिनोर्बोधनेन मम प्रयोजनमिति ।

From whatever quarter comes the message of Truth, I listen to it; and in this, Dara says, he derives his ability and aid only from God.

अत्र च परमेश्वरादेव मम सामर्थ्यं, परमेश्वर एव मम सहायः ।

Dara then proceeds to set forth his thesis of unity by dividing the subject into several sections, and pointing out the terminological as well as ideological identities between Hinduism and Islam. The following are the heads under which Dara emphasises the unity of the two faiths:

1. The 5 Elements. अथ नासिरापरपर्यायभूतव्याख्या ।
2. The 5 Senses. अथ इन्द्रियानि पञ्च ।

3. Contemplation and Spiritual Exercises. अथ ध्याननिरूपणम्। Dara mentions here the great yogic Vidyā called Ajapā japa, which every breathing indvidual does by the very act of his existence; and quoting the Kuran, points out that the Holy Kuran too mentions this Ajapā Vidyā only, though its reciters do not know this. In the Ajapā japa, the outgoing breath refers to सः and the inhaled breath to अहम्,—सोऽहम्,(अ)हं सः He is I, I am He. These two words सः and अहम् have their parallel in the Sufistic Hū Allāh, He is God.

तत्र यद्यपि सर्वश्वासनिरोधा नानाविधाः सिद्धैः उक्ताः, तथापि अजपां सर्वोत्कृष्टां वदन्ति, यत इयं जाग्रद्दशायां स्वप्नदशायां च स्वभावतः सर्वप्राणिनां सर्वदा संभवति । तदुक्तमस्मद्वेदे 'नास्ति किंचिद् ईदृशं वस्तु यत्परमेश्वर-जपं सर्वदा न करोति' इति । परन्तु भवन्तो न जानन्ति अनेन अजपाजप एवोक्तः । तस्योच्चारणे पदद्वयं कृतं - तत्र श्वासस्य उपरिगमने 'स' इति पदमाविर्भवति, नीचैरागमने 'अहम्' इति अस्यार्थः 'सोऽहम्' इति । अस्मदेकात्मवादिनोऽपि (i.e. the Sufis) श्वासाक्रियायां 'हू अल्लाह' इजि जानन्ति, श्वासस्योपरिगमने 'हू' इति, बहिरागमने 'अल्लाह' इति प्रकटीभवति ।

4. The 4th section deals with God's Attributes—
अथ परमेश्वरगुणव्याख्यानम् ।

5. Soul—अथ रूहापरपर्यायस्य आत्मनो निरूपणम् ।

6. Air—प्राणादिनिरूपणम् ।

7. The four Worlds or States जगच्चतुष्टयनिरूपणम् ।
Here Dara quotes from the Sanskrit work Bahmajñāna which is in the form of a dialogue between Mahādeva and Pārvatī.

Then Sound, Nāda—अथ शब्दनादयोर्व्याख्या ।

Here Dara deals with Om, the Praṇava.

8. Nūr or Light—प्रकाश

9. Realisation or Sākṣātkāra—अथ ईश्वरदर्शननिरूपणम् ।
Here Dara refers to a praiseworthy tenet of the Sunnis.

10. God's Names—
अथ नामानि निरूप्यन्ते

11. Men of realisation—
अथ सिद्धत्व-ऋषि-ईश्वरत्वानिरूपणम् ।

12. Quarters—Dik.

13. Earth—Pṛthivī. The seven lokas and Purāṇic geography are dealt with here.

14. The Great Deluge-Mahāpralaya. Dara quotes here the Yoga Vāsiṣṭha.

15. Salvation—अथ मुक्तिनिरूपणम् । Jīvanmukti and Videhamukhi, the Virāṭpuruṣa, the Ganges, Jumna and Sarasvatī as the three Nāḍīs, Ilā,, Piṅgalā and Śuṣumnā—are dealt with here.

16. Day and Night and Time.

अथ अहोरात्रस्य ब्रह्मणो गुप्तप्रकटतारूपस्य निरूपणम् ।

All through the work, we find Dara thoroughly at home in all the major and minor aspects of Hinduism; more prominent than his wide scholarship is his deep understanding and genuine spirit born of realisation. It is no vain claim that he makes at the end of this work that, prompted by his own self which is of the form of God Viṣṇu, he churned the Vedic ocean with the true and false impulses as the Gods and demons and his own mind as the churning mountain, Mandara, and brought out a gem of wisdom which excelled all the fourteen gems that the Devas and Asuras brought forth by churning the ocean.

विष्णुरूपात्मन इच्छया स्वीयमनो मन्दरं कृत्वा संकल्पविकल्पान् देवदैत्यान् कृत्वा वेदसमुद्रं मथित्वा ज्ञानरत्नमेकमीदृशं निष्कासितं, यद् देवैर्दैत्यैश्च समुद्रमथनं कृत्वा निष्कासितेषु चतुर्दशरत्नेष्वपि न प्राप्तम् ।

It is sad indeed that the production of this work should have outraged Aurangazeb and his orthodox Mullahs, and bought upon Dara capital punishment. But may this gem of wisdom, of understanding and harmony, which Dara brought out of the two oceans of Islam and Hinduism, mingled on the sacred soil of India, be a treasure constantly cherished by the votaries of both faiths. My we build up again the bridge of understanding which Akbar raised and Dara completed, so that we may both put forth our energies together, सह वीर्यं करवावहै, may not hate each other, मा विद्विषावहै, and an united India may spread to the world the message of peace which both of us profess, the *Salam* with which one greets everybody and tbe *Śānti* with which the other concludes everything.

BOOK-REVIEW.

Dr. B. C. Law Volume. Pt. 1. Indian Research Institute Calcutta. Pt. 2. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona.

Dr. Bimala Churn Law is well-known as a Scholar-Patron, one who has contributed two hundred papers and forty books as a scholar, and more than a lakh and a half donation for educational and cultural purposes besides big sums for social services, etc. It is indeed fit that thisVidvat-Prabhu should have been honoured by the world of scholars with two sumptuous volumes of learned articles.

The volumes are edited by Drs. S. Bhandarkar, Barua, Ghosh and Profs. Nilakanta Sastri and Gode, and published by the Indian Institute, Calcutta and the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona. Extending to nearly 1,200 pages, these two volumes contain papers contributed by scholars from India and abroad, covering every branch of Indology, and numbering one hundred and nineteen. It is not possible or necessary to review or mention the contents of these articles; it is enough to emphasise that volumes such as these, besides the honour they do to a scholar, form a substantial addition to Indology and will continue to be reference books of permanent value.

V. RAGHAVAN.

OBITUARY

MAHAVIDVAN R. RAGHAVA IYENGAR.

The passing away of Mahavidvan Bhasha-Kavisekhara R. Raghava Iyengar on 11-7-46 has removed from our midst one of the greatest Tamil Scholars of all times. He enjoyed this unique distinction in no uncertain degree. Endowed with an intellect subtle and penetrating, a mind richly stored with ancient learning, a memory as prodigious as it was resourceful, and a gift of speech rarely equalled in recent times, Mr. Raghava Iyengar was indeed a power in the world of Tamil scholarship. That he should have captivated by his solid merits and sparkling brilliance, orators and thinkers like the late Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, Sir S. Varadachari and scholars

like Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastrigal is tribute enough. He was eager to discover talent and was generous and he encouraged younger men with his advice and guidance. His learning and knowledge were always available to all who sought his help.

He was adorning the Court of Ramnad as its Samsthana Vidvan for a good many years and the outside world had to content itself with occasional glimpses of this great man. What brought him into direct contact with the general public was his literary activity in connection with the Madura Tamil Sangam. He was the first editor of the *Sen Tamil*, the premier Tamil literary journal of our Presidency. Under his guidance, this literary journal rose like a meteor in reputation and in those years there was scarcely an issue of that journal which did not bear the stamp of his genius. He was a pioneer in literary and historical research. The several articles contributed by him reveal his profound scholarship, his critical acumen and his remarkable powers of analysis and exposition. His lectures on Kambaramayanam were marvels of scholarship and oratory and drew phenomenal crowds of admirers from near and far, to listen spell-bound and enthralled.

In an august assembly of Pandits and scholars gathered at the Sanskrit College, Mylapore, on the occasion of a Valmiki Day celebration of the Sanskrit Academy, Madras, in 1930, the late Mm. Karunkulam Krishna Sastrigal, Principal, in his great enthusiasm, presented him with a shawl.

Quite late in life he was appointed Head of the Research Department in Tamil of the Annamalai University and he discharged his duties with rare distinction. He was the author of several works in Tamil, the chief among them being Pārikāthai, an original poem, a translation of Śākuntala and a research work on the History of Tamil. Further he has written a learned commentary on Kurunthokai and a verse translation of the Bhagavadgītā (both await publication). The latter was read and expounded by him to a large and appreciative audience of the Sanskrit Academy at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, and later, the Sanskrit Academy honoured him with the title "Bhaṣākaviśekhara." The Tamil world today mourns the loss of this profound scholar with a poet's soul.--*S. Vaiyapuri Pillai aud P. N. Appuswami.*

We are sorry to learn that *Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit*, Retd. Director-General of Achaeology, Govt. of India, passed

away in Poona on Aug. 12th '46. He had made many excavations and expositions of the Indus Valley Civilization.

Another noted Archaeologist whom the world of Indologists lost recently is *Dr. Hirananda Sastri*, formerly of the Archaeological Dept. of India and then Director of Archaeology, Baroda State.

Panditaraja K. Rama Pisharoti of Cochin passed away on October 3rd 1946. He was a scholar of great attainments in Sāhitya, Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya. The Paṇḍitarāja wrote erudite commentaries on many Sanskrit classics, the Śākuntala, Mālavikāgnimitra, the Śukasundeśa, the Nārāyaṇīya and the Dhvanyāloka.

On October 30th, 1946, *Prof. H. H. Dodwell* died in London at the age of 67. A member once of the Indian Educational Service from 1908-22 and a Joint Editor of the Cambridge History of India, he was Professor of History of India in the London School of Oriental Studies. With F. Price, he was Joint Editor of the English Translation of the Private Diary of Anandarangam Pillai, published by the Government of Madras (1904-28).

In the passing away of *Mahamahopadhyaya Kapay Ramachandrachar* of Kumbakonam, on December 12th 1946 the world of Sanskrit Panditas has become poor. He was 79 at his death. An authority on Dvaita Vedanta and the Mahabharata and Sri Bhagavata, he was a very popular expounder of the Epics and Puranas.

On November, 12th 1946, the whole nation was in mourning on hearing of the passing away of the great Hindu, scholar and statesman, patriot, orator and educationist, *Pandit Madan Mohan Malavya*, the founder of the Benares Hindu University. His passing away is an irreparable loss to Hindu culture and Sanskrit learning, as much as to Indian nationalism.

In the death of *Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar*, the field of historical research has lost a pioneer in South Indian history. An author of a number of articles, monographs, books and editions, Dr. Ayyangar died full of years as well as honours. He had held University Professorships, delivered Endowment Lectures, presided over both the Oriental Conference and the History Congress and received many other

distinctions. He was also editing for many years the Journal of Indian History.

On January 16th, 1947, *Pandit P. S. Anantanarayana Sastri* of Cochin passed away. By his death, Kerala has lost one more of its erudite Pandits. Sri Sastri was a sound Vaiyakarana and besides several text books, had edited also the grammatical work Praveśaka.

On February 14th, 1947, Sri D. Balasubramanya Ayyar, a life-member of the K. S. R. I., passed away. Through the B. G. Paul & Co., of which he was the Proprietor, he published many Research works on Vijayanagar History, Kadambas etc. Through the Kamakoti Kosasthana of which he was the Founder-Secretary, he published a number of Sanskrit hymns with English and Tamil translations.

INDIAN CULTURE ESSAY COMPETITION

THE BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN invites original essays on any aspect of Bharatiya Samskriti (Indian Culture) written in Sanskrit, Hindi or English for the annual Essay Competitions which have been started in 1942. This year six gold medals (each of the value of Rs. 150) and six silver medals (each of the value of Rs. 25) are to be awarded. One gold medal and one silver medal will be awarded to the best and second best essay respectively received under each of the groups mentioned below. The branches of study given below in brackets are neither exhaustive divisions of the groups nor topics for essays in themselves, but are intended only to give a general idea of each group to a layman.

(1) Religion and Philosophy (Buddhistic, Jaina, Nyaya-Vaisheshika, Samkhya yoga, Vedanta, Mimamsa, Vyakarana etc.).

(2) Art and Architecture (Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jaina, etc.).

(3) Languages, Literature (Samskrita, Prakrita, Apabhramsha, Modern Indian Vernaculars, etc.), Linguistics and Literary Criticism.

(4) History (Political).

(5) Social and Economic Order.

(6) One gold and one silver medal have been specially donated for the best and next best essay on "Bhagavad Gita and Life".

CONDITIONS

1. The essays must be submitted by the end of November, each year.

2. Each essay must cover approximately 150 pages of foolscap sheets typed in double spacing (single side only).

3. The copyright of the gold medal essays will vest in the Bhavan subject to minor privileges to the authors.

4. The manuscript which should have temporary binding must bear the nom-de-plume of the contributor on the cover page and strict care should be taken to avoid disclosing the identity of the contributor. A sealed envelope bearing the nom-de-plume of the competitor on the outside and containing a slip giving his name and full address as also the nom-de-plume should be sent along with each essay.

5. Each contributor is allowed to choose the subject he prefers.

6. The decision of the judges selected by the Bhavan will be final.

7. Though every care will be taken of the MSS. no responsibility attaches to the Bhavan in respect of them and authors are advised to keep duplicate copies with them.

BHARATYA VEDYA BHAVAN
Chowpatty Road, Bombay, 7.

J. H. DAVE,
Hon. Registrar.

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

1. **Vibhrama-Viveka** of Maṇḍana Miśra—edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Vedāntālaṅkāra Prof. T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Madras .. 0 12 0
2. **Vīṇavāsavadatta** (an old Sanskrit drama), edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Dr. C. Kuhan Raja, M.A., D. Phil. (Oxon.), Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras .. 0 8 0
3. **Tolkāppiyam** with an English translation, by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi (Vol. I). .. 1 0 0
4. **Tolkāppiyam** Do. Do. Vol. II, Part 1 .. 2 0 0
5. **History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil,** by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi .. 6 0 0
6. **Dhvanyaloka & Locana** of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with Kaumudī by Uttuṅgodaya and Upalocana edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.), Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani, M.A. Uddyota I .. 8 0 0
7. The Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume .. 3 0 0
8. Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 2 0 0
9. Compromises in the History of Vedanta by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri. .. 1 4 0

Copies an be had of: **The Secretaries,**

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute,

Mylapore, MADRAS.

SELECT OPINIONS

Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.—This evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.—Your excellent Issue.

F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory.......... A Journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January 1927.—......This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly articles: a very pretty start!

"Bombay Chronicle." 12th December, 1926.—................ The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

"Indian Review." November, 1927.—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research................The influence of Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning........

"New India," 20th December, 1926.—.............The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

"Hindu," 9th Feburary, 1927.—...........The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.—...............The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work....

Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.—......It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.—.........I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the orginality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions.....

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MADRAS.

GOVERNING BODY.

PRESIDENT:

SRI T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRI, C.I.E.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI IYER, LL.D., K.C.I.E.
SIR S. RADHAKRISHNAN.
DR. SIR A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR, LL.D., D.SC.

TRUSTEES:

RAO BAHADUR K. V. KRISHNASWAMI IYER, B.A., B.L.
RAO BAHADUR A. A. VENKATARAMA IYER.

TREASURER:

SRI M. SUBBARAYA IYER, B.A., B.L.

MEMBERS:

RAO BAHADUR G. A. NATESAN.
RAO BAHADUR PROF. D. S. SARMA.
DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI.
PROF. P. N. SRINIVASACHARIAR.
SRI N. RAGHUNATHAN.
SRI PROF. T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A., L.T.

SECRETARIES:

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA IYER, B.A., B.L.
SRI PROF. A. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR, M.A.
SRI DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A. PH.D.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN:

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA.

VICE-CHAIRMAN:

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.

MEMBERS:

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI.
DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M.A., PH.D.
DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA, M.A., D.PHIL.
DR. A. SANKARAN, M.A., PH.D.
DR. T. R. CHINTAMANI, M.A., PH.D.
PROF. V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, M.A.

EX-OFFICIO:

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA IYER, B.A., B.L.
SRI PROF. A. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR, M.A.
DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D. (*Correspondent for the Journal*).

All Communications should be addressed to the Correspondent, Journal of Oriental Research, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras.

PRINTED BY N. RAMARATNAM, M.A., B.L., AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS
55 & 56 MUNDAKANNI AMMAN KOIL STREET, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS 76.
PUBLISHED BY K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, KSRI., MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS. 394.